

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

ADDRESSING Convocation the Archbishop of Canterbury spoke of the years of King George's 'steadfast service.' This magazine had gone to press last month before we heard the sad words, 'He whom we loved as King has passed from our midst,' and so this month we would pay our tribute to that King whose reign covered the most difficult period that any monarch ever lived through and who during the whole of the years toiled for his people, often beyond his strength. It was at a time of constitutional crisis that he came to the throne. In four years' time there was the world's greatest war. Then came trouble in Ireland; in India. And then the economic crisis. And during all the twenty-five years England was blessed with a King who never spared himself, and more and more endeared himself to his people, by his unceasing labours on their behalf, by his kindness, humility, and complete integrity of life.

It is good to remember the happiness that the Jubilee demonstrations brought King George—so spontaneous, so widespread they were. They recall to our minds the words of Donald Hankey in *The Beloved Captain*: 'We were his men, and he was our leader. There was a bond of mutual confidence between us, which grew stronger and stronger as the months passed. The fact was that he had won his way into our affections. We loved him.'

We think of Queen Mary and remember their happy home life—how he spoke of her as 'my dear wife.' We pay our tribute of affectionate recognition to the strength she was to him and to her faithful service also for her people.

The mantle has fallen on King George's son, and we have sound ground for believing that the fine

tradition of service will be carried on. Was not his motto as Prince of Wales 'Ich Dien'? And do we not remember the tedious tasks that he went through patiently, and the sympathy and understanding he has shown to those who are handicapped in life? We rejoice at the gifts he has so richly inherited, and pray God He will bless our King.

Behind all those years of steadfast loving service there lay King George's sense of duty to God. The Archbishop of Canterbury, who had known him as a friend for forty years, has said of his religion, 'It was at once most simple and most real. It was based, not upon emotion, but upon a reverent sense of his duty to God. It showed itself in certain fixed habits of his life, his daily prayers, his daily reading of the Bible, his attendance every Sunday, wherever he might be, at the public worship of God. The use of the Name of God in public utterance was for him no mere convention, but the expression of simple reverence and a deep sense of his own responsibility towards God.'

'When all is said,' wrote Dr. W. R. Matthews, Dean of St. Paul's, 'probably the greatest service which the late King rendered to the people of this land was something quite imponderable, which will never find a place in history books. It was the influence of a transparently simple character. We cannot estimate the value of having a man at the head of the State whom no sane person could suspect of any personal ambition, who was plainly set upon doing his duty in the most difficult circumstances, who never despaired of the State in the darkest hours, and who quite obviously had no aim but to promote the well-being of his subjects; who loved England without sentimentality and served her without thought of applause.'



THE distinction between *revelation* and *discovery* is well known, but rarely, we think, has it been made so clearly, and with such an emphasis on its practical importance, as in Professor H. H. FARMER's valuable book, *The World and God* (Nisbet ; 10s. 6d. net).

Both words refer to the apprehension of truths and facts of our world, but whereas in discovery there is activity only on the side of the inquirer, in revelation there is activity of a personal kind *on the part of God* ; in the one case we work in an impersonal medium, in the other in one which is personal. 'When we turn to the religious usage of the term revelation,' says Professor FARMER, 'we find that quite central in it is the living sense of God as entering into personal rapport with the soul, the living sense, that is to say, of God as active personal will approaching the individual in his own immediate situation in absolute demand and final succour.'

It is at once obvious that, if this is a true account of revelation, it is of vital importance whether we can find room for such a divine activity in our conceptions of God and the world. Is it true to-day that even when we use the word 'revelation' in respect of the knowledge of God, the thought of God's personal activity is not often present, 'or, if present, is so in such an attenuated form that the word discovery would be just as appropriate'? Does the existing religious situation furnish fresh evidence of the loss of the sense of God as personal, and of the obsession of men's minds with what is in reality a monistic system of thought?

Professor FARMER's conviction is that the peril at which we have hinted is real, and he thinks it is to be traced to two popular non-religious uses of the term 'revelation' which have worked back into religious thought with unfortunate results.

First, there is the use of the word in connexion with any sudden acquirement of knowledge which appears to be disconnected with our own efforts of research and discovery. We ponder long over a problem, and when we are doing, or thinking of,

something else, the solution flashes into our mind. Secondly, we use the word from the standpoint of philosophy and speak of the ultimate reality of the universe as 'revealed' in phenomena. Or, as scientists, we say that the law of gravitation is 'revealed' in falling apples and stones, and like phenomena. No one would wish to ban such uses of the idea of revelation, even if it were possible ; but is it not easy, through such usages, to lose the fully religious connotation of the term?

As regards the first use of the word, says Professor FARMER, 'we have many consciously or unconsciously echoing Schleiermacher when he says, in effect, that the bearers of revelation in religion are simply the great men of religious history, who by a unique gift perceive something new and introduce it into man's religious outlook, so that all thereafter are enabled, in greater or less degree, to share in it.' Whatever truth there may be in this way of looking at things, it is undeniably unfortunate. It concentrates on moments when something original occurs in religion and obscures the fact that all living religious experience has the quality of revelation in it. It hides the distinctiveness of revelation in religion, and 'it is apt to give the ordinary believer a wrong estimate of his own religious life.'

'It is often said : "Oh, I have had no revelations" ; yet, if week by week, in the worship of the Christian fellowship, ordinary folk apprehend anew, in relation to their own individual situation, the challenge and the forgiveness of God, that is every bit as much revelation as ever came to the most gifted prophet or seer in history.'

The second popular use of the word 'revelation,' with reference to an order known through the phenomena of Nature and history, is more clearly religious ; yet too easily the scientist or philosopher may leave out the thought of an activity on the other side. 'This, perhaps, is of no moment in itself, but it becomes of moment when the usage works back into theology and into men's whole approach to religion.'

Thus, Professor FARMER works back to his



foundation conception of revelation as 'a category of personal relationship.' 'Our position is . . . that wheresoever and whensoever God declares Himself to the individual soul in such wise that He is apprehended as holy will actively present within the immediate situation, asking obedience at all costs and guaranteeing in and through such asking the soul's ultimate succour, there is revelation.' But if every situation may be the medium of revelation, any situation is not necessarily of this character; for the notion that we should be able to find the active presence of God in all events and situations is merely pietistic. In making this point Professor FARMER displays shrewd judgment. 'Much of man's life,' he says, 'of necessity runs in a routine of daily tasks which are the better done for receiving undivided attention undisturbed by the explicit awareness of God.' In many decisions what is required is 'only some experience and common sense.'

What, then, is the kind of situation in life which may rightly be expected to be a medium of revelation? To this question Professor FARMER'S answer, put briefly, is that it is a situation which calls for decision and obedience. Only then can it mediate vivid awareness of personal rapport with God. 'Revelations in this sense are always points of tension in the soul's history, and therefore points of crisis, where the soul must take either a step forward or a step backward in understanding God and in stature as a child of God.' This fresh treatment of a well-worn theme is only one example chosen from many in a living discussion of the problems of Prayer, Providence, and Miracle in Christian Experience.

Dr. W. R. MATTHEWS, the Dean of St. Paul's, has published the substance of his Alexander Robertson Lectures recently delivered at the University of Glasgow, under the title *The Purpose of God* (Nisbet; 7s. 6d. net). It is a subject which lies at the heart of the modern theistic apologia, and it is significant that the Dean's two predecessors in the Alexander Robertson Lectureship dealt with the

self-same subject, although with different methods of approach.

There is much historical matter in the earlier part of this volume, in which the Design Argument is examined in its general theistic setting and its classical formulations, and the objections to it by Kant, Hume, and others are considered. In the later part of the volume the idea of a teleological universe is defended in the light of modern thought. Any adequate defence must take into account the problems raised by the fact of evil in the universe, and Dr. MATTHEWS pays some attention to such problems, hoping to give a fuller treatment in a subsequent work.

Let us see how he deals with the problem of human history as it presents itself in a teleological view of the world. If the system of Nature and the evolution of life culminate in the emergence of personal beings, then one might anticipate that the purposive character of the world would be plainly shown in the sphere of history. But is it so?

On the one hand, it has been held that history has no significance and that to search for its meaning is futile. This is the view expressed by Anatole France in his apologue of the young king who, out of his desire to be guided by the lessons of history, appointed a Commission of learned men to discover what they were. On his death-bed the last survivor of the erudite band whispered in the young king's ear the dismal conclusion: 'Men are born, they suffer, they die—that is all.'

On the other hand, it has been held that all events in history are significant and that the search for their meaning is to be encouraged. Providence governs the whole of human life, and everything was fore-known and fore-ordained in the infinite wisdom of God. Leibniz conceived the Creator as having reviewed before Creation all the possible universes and brought into being that one which contained the maximum of good and the minimum of evil.

Both of these views as to whether any teleological



direction can be seen in history are extremes. The purposive nature of the world-process in the inorganic and organic realms makes against the first view, and against the second view may be set the frustration of higher tendencies through natural happenings. Chance or accident seems at least to play a part in human affairs when a man of genius dies before the completion of his work, or when an epidemic or a change of climate destroys a whole culture.

---

Despite, however, the presence of chance or accident in the universe, we may still contend that history shows a teleological character. Notice, first, that the historical process has included a long struggle with and eventual dominance over the material environment—a struggle which opens its final phase in the development of modern science. And no bound can be set in theory to the power over the environment which science may secure.

---

Secondly, there has proceeded, concurrently with the attempt to dominate the environment, the attempt to conquer the lower self. The development of the moral consciousness is the process by which the animal self is superseded and controlled by a higher self directed towards ideals. The moral consciousness, when conjoined—as historically it has been—with the religious consciousness, gives rise to the sense of guilt and sin, in which the teleological nature of the universe finds its most universal expression. For it presupposes a cosmic purpose of ideal good, to which sin is a hindrance.

---

Thirdly, we must consider the cosmic purpose manifested in history from the standpoint not only of the environment and of the development of the self, but also from that of the social ideal. For there appears to be an ideal implicit in the social development of mankind, subject as it has so markedly been to the influence of sheer chance and thus full of perplexity for the exponent of teleology. And the ideal is implicit not only in the vague sense that men are urged on to a better state by a divine dissatisfaction, but in the more definite sense that we can already discern its outlines. The ideal

society or community would be one in which, through the social relation, each individual comes to the realization and expression of his nature and its potentialities.

---

It may be, however, that the full social ideal can only be conceived as a Kingdom of God which is not of this world. But it remains true that there can be endless approximation in this world to the ideal, and its presence in men's minds, however vague and dream-like in form, is the secret of man's unquenchable hope of the future.

---

After all, human history is still in the making. We are reading a story of which we know, and that very imperfectly, only a part. We are presented with a wavering line and not with a rational curve, still less with a straight upward path. And was not the possibility of wavering an element in the design? Chance only partly accounts for the set-backs and disasters of history, for the frustrations of high promise; they are also due in part to the failure of persons and societies to respond to their vocation. Nevertheless, history discloses purpose and direction. There is something significant going on—the progressive creation of man.

---

'This, then, is my philosophy of religion.' These are Professor John MACMURRAY's words at the end of the chapter entitled 'Religious Reality' in his book just published, *Reason and Emotion* (Faber & Faber; 7s. 6d. net). What is that philosophy? We shall see. But we may preface a summary of it with two remarks. First, Professor MACMURRAY is not easy to follow. His thinking is somewhat exacting. And secondly, he seems to be an 'unconscionable time' in getting to his religious conclusion. But then he would say, quite rightly, that his conclusion was implicit in the whole process of reasoning. In any case be patient while we drive along to the goal.

---

He begins with an interesting point. The philosophy of religion arises because the philosopher is faced with a claim which religion makes, and cannot



help making. It is the claim that reality is personal. If that claim is untrue, religion is irrational and misleading. If it is true, any philosophy which denies it is false and misleading. The philosopher, if he is to carry out the task which he has set himself, of expressing the nature of reality, cannot leave religion out of account. He must evaluate the claim which is implicit in all religious experience and reach some conclusion about its validity. It would seem that in the nature of things this is a claim upon which no compromise is possible. The philosopher must either accept the personal character of the real, or he must reject completely the claim of religion to be a necessary and wholesome expression of human nature. If reality is not personal, religion is an illusion.

---

But (and here Professor MACMURRAY begins to be a trifle difficult) both these terms 'real' and 'personal' are not unambiguous. They supply us with marks of interrogation. What do we mean by real? What do we mean by personal? To determine the validity of religion it is necessary to determine the meaning of these terms. 'What I wish to do in this lecture is to express the results of my own thinking about what personality is, in order to explain what I mean when I accept the religious claim that reality is personal. The question is perhaps the most difficult of all questions, and what I have to say about it is neither final nor satisfactory, but I think that it points in a definite direction which ought to be explored.'

---

Well, then, here is a point—and it is really the author's main point—the source of the tendency to make religion subjective by denying the personality of God arises from a misconception of personality. Personality is not individualism. We are persons because we live in and through what is not ourselves. Our dependence on what is not ourselves is the core of our reality. And the objectivity of our experience reveals a threefold dependence upon the world by revealing three levels of objective reality. We know the world as matter, as life, and as personality. This knowledge is the knowledge of a threefold nature in ourselves, and of a threefold dependence of ourselves upon the world.

We may summarize this section briefly. As persons we have an objective consciousness of matter. We know material objects. But this knowledge is inherently a knowledge of ourselves as material objects. It is equally a knowledge of our dependence as material objects upon the society of material objects which is the material world. But if we were merely material objects in a material world we should not know ourselves even as material objects. Such knowledge presupposes that we already know ourselves as more than material. The same is true of the world of organic life. We can only assert our animal nature because we already have a consciousness of ourselves as persons.

---

And so we reach this further point, that the primary condition of our being is our objective consciousness of a world of personality of which we are members and within which we are dependent individuals. It is in and through my consciousness of other persons alone that I can know myself as a person. To be a person is to live as member of a personal reality, in dependence upon it. To put the matter in a different way, personality is essentially mutual (this is the core of much of Professor MACMURRAY's thinking). There can be no such thing as an isolated person. It is only in relationship between itself and another person that the self can exist at all. The self can never be independent and alone. The true formula is not 'I and the world,' but 'I and you,' or 'I and you and the world.' This mutuality of the personal is the basis of religion. Personality is essentially friendship or the communion of persons.

---

This may be expanded a little more before we come to the religious conclusion. There is a definite field of empirical experience which is the field of religion. It is the field of personal life, the field of personal relationships. Professor Whitehead is therefore wrong when he says that religion is what a man does with his solitariness. Religion is what a man makes of his personal relationships. We may use other persons as instruments. Slavery is the crudest form of this. And this is irreligious, because there is no mutuality or equality in the relation. The same thing is true—this is not so



obvious or even clear—when the relationship is one of co-operation in a common purpose.

‘So far I have made no mention of God.’ That is, says Professor MACMURRAY, because he wished to lay the foundation securely. But in his concluding pages he makes the omission good, indicating how essential to the view he has outlined is the idea of God. All experience, he says, at any level is the experience of the finite in the infinite. Even a triangle, as Spinoza pointed out, can be seen, or imagined, only as a limitation of infinite space. At the material level we apprehend all material objects as finite and dependent upon the material infinite. This is not a matter of reflection, but of immediate common experience. Similarly, we apprehend all organisms as finite dependents of infinite life.

And when we come to the personal field it is no different. It has been already insisted that our apprehension of ourselves as persons is at the same time an apprehension of our dependence upon what is not ourselves. We can now see that it is an apprehension of our own dependence, and the dependence of all other finite persons, upon infinite personality. God as infinite personality is the

primary natural experience of all persons. ‘That, then, is my philosophy of religion.’ We could have wished a little more about the concluding stage of the argument, particularly about the apprehension of anything being an apprehension of the finite in the infinite.

Instead, Professor MACMURRAY points out the concrete, practical meaning of his philosophy. It is not so much a reflective formulation of religion, as we know it, as a demand for a new step in the creation of human society. The field of the personal, which is the field of religion, is one where we grope in the dark and in which our civilization is perilously unskilled. In that field the modern world remains a world of individualism. It is, therefore, anti-religious. Our religious life remains primitive and undeveloped. The religious task remains unfulfilled. Its goal is the creation of a human society, universal in its extent, based upon the community of persons. We have to address ourselves to the task of creating the life of truly personal relationship between men, and of destroying those elements in modern society which frustrate and deny it. Whatever works for this end is religious. Whatever opposes it is the enemy of religion.

## Recent Thoughts on the Doctrine of the Atonement.

BY THE REVEREND J. G. RIDDELL, M.A., PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY,  
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

IN February 1926 an article by the Rev. Robert Mackintosh, D.D., under this title, was published in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. It reviewed the literature on the doctrine of Atonement published during the previous decade—in the years following Dean Rashdall's famous Bampton Lectures of 1915<sup>1</sup>—and found in it, apart from purely historical contributions and certain re-interpretations of the writings of Dr. Denney and Dr. Forsyth, a predominantly Abelardian outlook<sup>2</sup> which seemed to

the writer lacking in objectivity and unwisely intolerant of any penal element in atonement. There were, moreover, other tendencies discernible in the theology of these years which aroused misgiving and led to a protest against the blotting out of justice from the moral ideal and the degrading of God's love into an unethical softness, which was described as ‘the master error of our day, and the form in which the contemporary mind becomes guilty of apostasy from God.’<sup>3</sup>

Ten years have passed and two notable changes at least have taken place in the theological situation

<sup>1</sup> *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology* (Macmillan, 1925).

<sup>2</sup> xxxvii. 200.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, 203.



as regards the doctrine of Atonement. On the one hand, a greater diversity of outlook is reflected in the thought of the last ten years, set forth in books varying alike in technicality and size from the popular statement of Dr. Waterhouse's *What is Salvation?*<sup>1</sup> to the lengthy treatment of Brunner in the 'spiral movement' of *The Mediator*<sup>2</sup> and its argument. For the subjective and objective theories, which Dr. Mackintosh found to be almost exclusive alternatives, there has been substituted quite a variety of approaches to the central problem. Canon Green uses a suggestive analogy<sup>3</sup> when he compares the doctrine of Atonement to 'some vast cathedral which we must view from without and within, looking east and looking west, indeed from a hundred points of view, before any true idea of it can be gained.' It is as though different observers were each telling us something of the beauty and wonder of the great cathedral within which all of them are standing and which they are seeking, in their own ways, to describe. The analogy, moreover, illustrates another feature also of recent theological thought. Just as the cathedral is full of reminders to us of the wisdom and skill of those who designed and built it to the glory of God in bygone days, so in our thinking about the Atonement we find ourselves constantly recalling doctrines first formulated many centuries ago. Both in the variety of the standpoints which have been adopted, and in their indebtedness to the great doctrines of the past, the contributions to the theory of Atonement in recent years are noteworthy.

On the other hand, as regards the narrower issue of subjective or objective interpretations, there has been, in many quarters, a marked reaction from the former type of theory, which seemed to be gaining fuller acceptance in the period of which Dr. Mackintosh wrote, and a new emphasis has been laid upon the objective aspect of God's ways with men. Dr. H. R. Mackintosh, for example, in *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness*,<sup>4</sup> spoke of Atonement as 'what it cost God to forgive the sin of the world.' While repudiating the suggestion 'that God had to be induced to love men, and that what Christ did and suffered provided the inducement,' he suggested the inadequacy of any merely subjective interpretation, in the assertion that 'through the reconciling work of Christ not merely is God's love exhibited on an absolute scale, but

a new situation arises for the sinful as between God and them.'<sup>5</sup> Dr. Kenneth E. Kirk, in *Essays Catholic and Critical*,<sup>6</sup> had given an interpretation of the Atonement which followed closely the Anselmic type, while the composite volume *Atonement in History and Life*<sup>7</sup> tended for the most part to emphasize the truth of the objective theory of Atonement. The most definite protest against subjective theory has come, however, from writers of the Barthian School and is conspicuous in Emil Brunner's *The Mediator*. We may take this work as the most complete and thoroughgoing modern exposition of the Anselmic type of theory. It has, indeed, been described as an 'act of reparation to Anselm.'<sup>8</sup> Believing that the theologian has to show that 'there are not many "articles of faith" but only one,'<sup>9</sup> Brunner deals comprehensively with Revelation, with the person of the Mediator and the problems of Incarnation, before coming to his exposition of the work of Christ and his doctrine of reconciliation, in which the subjective theory, traced back in its modern form to Schleiermacher and Ritschl, is definitely set aside. 'It is suggested,' writes Brunner in criticism of it, 'that as man beholds this picture of the Man who gives Himself up so completely, with so much love and faithfulness to God, the divine love and faithfulness will be manifested to Him. . . . Here the only gulf which separates man from God is illusory, namely, it is that which human error has placed between itself and God. Reconciliation simply means the removal of a religious error.'<sup>10</sup> Brunner would have us abandon such a view, which, he asserts, does no justice to the gravity of man's sin, or to the self-consistent righteousness of God, and asks us to recognize afresh the merits which mere negative criticism has often concealed in the objective theory of Anselm and those who have followed him.

Taking what has been frequently held to be the part of Anselm's theory most open to criticism, Brunner seeks to set it in a new and more favourable light, and to show how much in harmony it is with his characteristic doctrine of divine sovereignty. 'Nothing,' he says, 'is easier than to caricature the statements of the Bible and of Christianity about the penal sufferings of Christ in such a way

<sup>1</sup> P. 210.

<sup>2</sup> S.P.C.K., 1926.

<sup>3</sup> Hodder & Stoughton ('The Westminster Books'), 1933.

<sup>4</sup> Eng. tr. (Lutterworth, 1934).

<sup>5</sup> *Our Lord and Saviour*, 78 (Longmans, 1928).

<sup>6</sup> P. 190 (Nisbet, 1927).

<sup>7</sup> S.P.C.K., 1929 (Ed. W. L. Grensted). The essay by R. S. Cripps, a study in Isaiah 52<sup>18-53</sup>, stressing the objective value of Atonement in the sight of God, was published separately under the title *The Prophets and the Atonement* (S.P.C.K., 1931).

<sup>8</sup> G. Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 100 (S.P.C.K., 1931).

<sup>9</sup> P. 16.

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, 439.



that behind these "theories" we seem to perceive the figure of some bloodthirsty Oriental monarch, or of some primitive Eastern divinity, with his whims and caprices. But in reality the absolute sovereignty of God is the presupposition of this revelation, and, wherever the idea of a "democratic God" is entertained, there will be no intelligent understanding of the meaning of the Cross.<sup>1</sup> None the less, Brunner points out, it is not, as Anselm held, merely because of God's glory—still less because He so chose—but because only thus could sin as we know it be met, that Atonement is necessary, and it is wrought out not from the human but from the divine side.<sup>2</sup> Naturally following from this thought of the divine sovereignty, Brunner welcomes Anselmic teaching regarding man's utter sinfulness and helplessness. Forgiveness is never easy, and the measure of guilt is only to be found in that which is needed to remove it. 'The more real guilt is to us, the more real also is the gulf between us and God, the more real is the wrath of God, and the inviolable character of the law of penalty; the more real also the obstacle between God and man becomes, the more necessary becomes the particular transaction, by means of which the obstacle, in all its reality, is removed. The more serious our view of guilt, the more clearly we perceive the necessity for an objective—and not merely subjective—Atonement. To deny this necessity means the *nondum consideravisse pondus peccati*.'<sup>3</sup> Only in Christ has humanity been able to perceive its separation from God—and in characteristic words Brunner goes on to assert that 'in this one event, question and answer, need and the knowledge of need are present simultaneously. Only at the Cross of Christ does man see fully what it is that separates him from God; yet it is here alone that he perceives that he is no longer separated from God.'<sup>4</sup> One other quotation may be given to show Brunner's close alignment with the Latin doctrine of Atonement. The work of the Mediator, by whom the gulf separating man from God is bridged, is described in terms of guilt and penalty: 'The elaboration of the idea of penal satisfaction by Anselm was an act of outstanding importance,' and the rooting of theory of Atonement in the conception of divine law is welcomed, so long as law is taken seriously, not in the Kantian sense of abstract moral law, but as 'the manifested Will of the Lord God: eternally the same, self-consistent, unchangeable.'<sup>5</sup> It is true that Brunner would not have us think

exclusively in terms of satisfaction and penalty, but makes room for the idea of expiatory sacrifice as well: yet here also, and somewhat unexpectedly, he finds Anselmic authority, since, alongside predominantly forensic elements, Anselm uses the word 'satisfaction' as holding the balance evenly between the ideas of penalty and of sacrifice, and bringing out particularly clearly the idea of an equivalent.<sup>6</sup>

As an expiatory sacrifice 'intended to remove some obstacle which has come in between God and man,'<sup>7</sup> the Atonement is, for Brunner, a resolving of the dilemma between the need for sacrifice in view of the wrath of God, and the inadequacy of all sacrifice which can at best be only an 'apparent equivalent.' 'It is God Himself who expiates, who provides the sacrifice. . . . In the New Testament the Cross of Christ is conceived as the self-offering of God.'<sup>8</sup> This has a certain affinity at first sight to the treatment of the problem in Bishop Hicks' *The Fullness of Sacrifice*.<sup>9</sup> The modern recoil from the sacrificial view of Atonement, we read there, whether on the part of those who find substitutionary theories non-moral and prefer a subjective interpretation, or of others who fear merely external or magical ideas, has made it easier to forget the truth enshrined in sayings like 'cost is an essential of sacrifice': 'the goodness and severity of God.'<sup>10</sup> But Dr. Hicks writing from a 'Catholic' standpoint, which is concerned with the doctrine of the Eucharist more than with that of Atonement, has his own, very different, thesis as to the significance of sacrifice and its place in the theology of the Church. The threefold conception seen in the Old Testament practice of sin-offerings, burnt-offerings, and peace-offerings may be traced, he maintains, in the New Testament and in the Christian life still in a triple aspect. There is the Cross, the Resurrection, and the indwelling Christ—the life surrendered, the life transformed, the life shared.<sup>11</sup> Christian doctrine remained, on the whole, true to this view of sacrifice till the time of Augustine and perhaps later, but in the teaching of the Schoolmen and in Reformation doctrine there was substituted the mistaken notion (still almost everywhere accepted) of atoning sacrifice as equivalent only to the death of Christ. This 'Essay in Reconciliation' is a plea for the recognition afresh of what its author holds to be the true doctrine of sacrifice—that while the work of our redemption was accomplished by death, death

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, 470.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, 472 n.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, 481.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, 477.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, 451.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, 451 f.

<sup>8</sup> *Op. cit.*, 482.

<sup>9</sup> Macmillan, 1930.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, 461.

<sup>10</sup> P. 126.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. p. 224.



is never to be 'regarded as an end in itself.'<sup>1</sup> 'Not the Atonement only, however we may define that, but the Incarnation also, in the fulness of its meaning, belong to Christ's sacrifice in all its stages.'<sup>2</sup> His Resurrection, the Ascension and Session, the giving of His new manhood to His own—these also are part of His sacrifice. 'The fatal identification between sacrifice and death,'<sup>3</sup> we read, has been the source not only of Eucharistic controversy but of many difficulties about the doctrine of Atonement, and in a return to the teaching of the Bible and of the early centuries regarding sacrifice there is to be found fresh hope of unity within the Christendom of to-day.

This theory may be compared not only with that of Brunner, but, as is pointed out below, with the views of other modern writers on the Atonement. Meanwhile, returning to *The Mediator*, let us note that its teaching is not Anselmic only, but goes back also to still earlier thinking. Thus Ritschl is criticised for suggesting two exclusive alternatives, 'either Anselm or the subjective interpretation.'<sup>4</sup> Brunner finds in this 'mistaken view that the Patristic doctrine of Redemption through Incarnation has been supposed to be a (Hellenistic) substitute for the doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation'<sup>5</sup> the source of much confusion. Instead of a sharp distinction between Patristic and Latin theories, Brunner would claim an identity of purpose and meaning illustrated in his interpretation of Irenæus as gathering up in his writings 'the whole wealth of the New Testament witness to Christ,'<sup>6</sup> and of Athanasius, whose Logos doctrine suggests that man, fallen away from the Word, can only be restored by the Word coming to him again.<sup>7</sup> The Greek doctrine of Incarnation and the Latin theory of Atonement are here treated not as rivals, but as necessary each to the other. Both reflect New Testament teaching on the one hand, and on the other anticipate true elements in Reformation doctrine.

While this return to a definitely objective theory has been widely influential, criticism of Anselmic views and defence of the moral influence theory have not been wanting. A new emphasis on the humanity of Jesus, a fuller study of the Gospels, and a less ready recognition of the authority of the Pauline Epistles have to be taken into account in this connexion. *Papers in Modern Churchmanship*<sup>8</sup> included a study of the Atonement by Douglas White, M.A., M.D., which pled for the acceptance

of a view of Christ's death not as satisfying God's justice, but as revealing His loving Fatherhood. Dr. John Baillie, in *The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity*,<sup>9</sup> dealt with the ethical and religious difficulties presented to the modern mind by Anselm's account of Christian Redemption, and set forth also the 'real and unchanging elements of truth that lie behind this whole conception of atonement with God through Jesus Christ,'<sup>10</sup> returning constantly for guidance to the gospel story of Christ's redemptive activity, its impression on His contemporaries and its influence in the Christian Church, and 'the new thought of God as Redeeming Love to which it leads and . . . the crowning Christian conviction that the advent and the life and the death of Jesus were themselves the supreme manifestation of God's redemptive activity towards the human race.'<sup>11</sup>

The importance of Anselm is recognized by another critic, who, like Dr. Baillie, begins his interpretation of the Atonement with an account of the 'Cur Deus Homo' and an estimate of its importance. Principal Franks, in his *History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ*,<sup>12</sup> remained 'reticent regarding the details of his personal belief,'<sup>13</sup> but in the Dale Lectures for 1933<sup>14</sup> he has given to us a candid statement of his own convictions. He offers an altogether different theory of the Atonement from that set out in *The Fullness of Sacrifice*,<sup>15</sup> and, while taking the 'Cur Deus Homo' as a guide, seeks to use the Anselmic method 'in the service of the Abelardian theory,'<sup>16</sup> thus finding himself in direct opposition to *The Mediator*. 'The rationality that Anselm valued in his theory of satisfaction,' he asserts, 'is what the Barthians most hate.'<sup>17</sup> The idea of divine sovereignty is said to be no true guide to the doctrine of Atonement, since the merely sovereign element in God is less than the highest that we know, namely, His love, and to use it to explain everything is really to abandon what is most distinctive to our Christian faith.<sup>18</sup> Further, the conception has been used in *The Mediator* to present successively Patristic and Anselmic views which are not only mutually incompatible,

<sup>9</sup> T. & T. Clark, 1929.

<sup>10</sup> P. 160.

<sup>11</sup> P. 160 f. <sup>12</sup> Hodder & Stoughton, 1915.

<sup>13</sup> R. Mackintosh, *loc. cit.*, 200.

<sup>14</sup> *The Atonement* (Oxford University Press, 1934).

<sup>15</sup> P. xiv. On the ground that no such complete rationale of sacrifice can be established, that the 'Catholic' and Protestant positions differ fundamentally and that a biological instead of a moral conception is used to explain the Atonement.

<sup>16</sup> P. 6 f.

<sup>17</sup> P. 20.

<sup>18</sup> P. 95.

<sup>1</sup> P. 242.

<sup>2</sup> P. 250 f.

<sup>3</sup> P. 243.

<sup>4</sup> P. 440.

<sup>5</sup> P. 440 n.

<sup>6</sup> P. 249.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, 229 n.

<sup>8</sup> Longmans, 1926.



but neither of which is acceptable to the Abelardian theory set forth in *The Atonement*. With theories of satisfaction, it is maintained, there is at best only the possibility of forgiveness. For assurance of salvation it was necessary for Anselm himself to supplement his own teaching 'with the thoughts of Christ's example and merit.'<sup>1</sup> 'The great protagonist of a purely objective doctrine . . . has to move to a completely different point of view before he can show how Christ really saves any man.'<sup>2</sup>

Whether we can follow Principal Franks in this argument, and in his trenchant criticism of *The Mediator*, or not, he has given us an attractive statement of the Abelardian theory. Sin, he declares, is to be defined as the rejection of divine

<sup>1</sup> P. 24.<sup>2</sup> P. 25.

love. God's free forgiveness is made known through the manifestation of His love in Christ's Cross. For the preaching of the gospel we need no satisfaction theory, for we are to believe, not in an objective transaction, in which Jesus paid in full the price of sin, but rather in the sheer love that pursues man to the hill of Calvary. By such love alone 'the hard and impenitent heart is softened and melted. Deep calls unto deep. Love answers love; and the Atonement is accomplished.'<sup>3</sup> This is the true doctrine of reconciliation—the only doctrine which the modern preacher can set forth not merely 'to garden cities, or house-parties, or conferences of earnest and well-meaning people'<sup>4</sup>—but to sinners, and to those who have no sense of sin.

<sup>3</sup> P. 196.<sup>4</sup> P. 195.

(To be continued.)

## Some Outstanding Old Testament Problems.

### V. Sacrifice in the Old Testament.

BY THE REVEREND PROFESSOR CHRISTOPHER R. NORTH, M.A., HANDSWORTH COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM.

THE main emphasis in modern study of the Old Testament has been upon the prophetic, rather than upon the priestly, elements in the religion. There has even been a disposition to set the two elements, the prophetic and the priestly, over against one another as contraries, and to regard the sacrificial religion of post-exilic times as a declension from the prophetic ideal, and even, in some measure, a reversion to primitive, non-moral conceptions. This is not to say that the study of the priestly literature has been neglected. But the majority of readers of this journal may have felt that such study has been off the main highway of religious development, a subject of antiquarian rather than of present-day religious interest.

Nevertheless, as we attempt to face the religious issues of our own time, we are finding it increasingly difficult to rest content with the antithesis between ethical and evangelical conceptions of religion on the one hand, and sacrificial and sacramental on the other. To set the two in permanent opposition is to reach an impasse. May there not be some higher synthesis in which the seeming opposites are reconciled? Sacramentalism may be evangelical, while it is not impossible for obedience to the prophetic exhortation to 'do justly' to degenerate into severe and unlovely work-righteousness.

The sacrificial worship of post-exilic times was not devoid of spirituality, and Principal Wheeler Robinson has reminded us that 'no just view of Jewish religion can be gained by any one who does not see the Psalter written, so to speak, in parallel columns with the Book of Leviticus' (*Religious Ideas of the Old Testament*, 150). Accordingly, there is a growing feeling that we cannot simply dismiss the large sacrificial element in Old Testament religion as a degenerate 'throw-back' to primitive ideas, irrelevant to true religion.

The problem before us would seem to be threefold: (1) What was the purpose of sacrifice? (2) (a) Did the prophets condemn sacrifice *as such*, or did they only condemn the abuse of it? And (b) if they condemned it as such, are we to accept theirs as the last word on the subject? (3) If the idea at the heart of sacrifice has any validity, has it any contribution to make to the Christian doctrine of the Atonement?

(1) *What was the Purpose of Sacrifice?*—We must recognize at the outset that the Old Testament nowhere gives any direct statement about the meaning of sacrifice, still less does it give any clear-cut theory of how sacrifice operated. The offering of sacrifices goes back, of course, to immemorial antiquity, and it is quite certain that



much of the early language associated with it survived into a period in which the original ideas had, to a large extent, been outgrown. We must, therefore, distinguish between (a) the original motive or motives underlying the institution, and (b) the motives that operated in the sacrificial system as it was finally elaborated in Leviticus and the related literature.

(a) *Early Ideas*.—It does not now seem possible to reduce these to one, such as the idea of sacramental communion with the deity, so elaborately worked out by Robertson Smith in *The Religion of the Semites*. It is more likely that several motives operated, even in very early times, and that they were not mutually exclusive of one another. Eichrodt's analysis may be taken as covering all the various types of sacrifice. He distinguishes (*Theologie des Alten Testaments*, i. 65) between:

(i) *Sacrifices as Food for the Gods*.—The idea was that the life-giving energy of the gods needed to be sustained and periodically renewed if Nature was to continue to function (cf. E. O. James, *Origins of Sacrifice*, *passim*). It survived into Old Testament times in the weekly presentation of the 'Shewbread,' and in such statements as that 'Yahweh smelled the sweet savour' of Noah's sacrifice (Gn 8<sup>21</sup>, J; cf. Lv 1<sup>9</sup>, etc., P). Even in P, offerings are still called 'God's food' (*leḥem 'elohim*, Lv 21<sup>6</sup>, etc.; cf. Ezk 44<sup>7</sup>, Mal 1<sup>7</sup>), and the 'meal-offering' (Lv 2) would seem to be reminiscent of the idea that the god needed bread and salt with his meat just as man does. But all such language in the Old Testament is probably archaic, and although the idea underlying it was current as late as the writing of Ps 50, the writer of the psalm is not a little contemptuous in his reference to it (v. 12<sup>1</sup>).

(ii) *Sacrifices as Gifts to the God*.—The relation of this to the preceding is obvious. That sacrifices were thought of as gifts to the deity is plain from both the terms, *minhâ* and *qorbân*, that are used in the Old Testament for sacrifices in general. Of them, *minhâ* means 'gift,' 'tribute,' and is used throughout the literature; *qorbân* means 'what is brought near,' 'oblation,' and is only found in Ezk, H, and P. The character of gift is especially prominent in the burnt-offering—*ôlâ*, 'that which ascends,' and its descriptive synonym *kâlîl*, 'holocaust'—which was wholly consumed on the altar, and in which no man, not even the officiating priest, had any share. This 'gift' aspect of sacrifice has been specially stressed by Gray, though he does not deny that other motives may have operated as well (*Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, 3).

(iii) *Sacrifice as an Act of Communion with the*

*Deity*.—This would seem to be the leading motive underlying the so-called 'peace-offering'—*shelem*, often called *zebhaḥ*, 'slaughter,' simply—which was pre-eminently the family or clan sacrifice (cf. 1 S 20<sup>6, 29</sup>). After the blood had been dashed against the altar, the choicest internal fats were offered to the deity, certain portions of the flesh were reserved for the priest as his perquisite, and the rest was eaten by the offerer and his friends. The idea of sacramental communion is clearest in the extraordinary story of the covenant-meal at Sinai, in which the seventy elders 'beheld God, and did eat and drink' (Ex 24<sup>8-11</sup>).

(iv) *Sacrifices as Expiatory*.—Although the idea of sacrifice as expiatory is most prominent after the Exile, we nevertheless read of occasional expiatory—or at least propitiatory—offerings in early times. Such are David's sacrifice on the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite (2 S 24<sup>25</sup>), while in the statement that 'the iniquity of Eli's house shall not be expiated (*yihkapper*) with sacrifice nor offering for ever' (1 S 3<sup>14</sup>), the sacrifice imagined is definitely expiatory. It is true that the terms *ḥatṭāth* (sin-offering) and *'āshām* (guilt-offering) are seldom used before Ezekiel, and then only for something less developed than the statutory sin- and guilt-offerings of post-exilic times. (The references are to 1 S 6<sup>3, 4, 8, 17</sup>, 2 K 12<sup>17</sup>, Is 53<sup>10</sup>.) But it now appears that the *'āshām* was known at Ras Shamra, though perhaps only in some such sense as that of the earlier Biblical references. However this may be, in some sin-offerings, as, for example, that offered by a woman after childbirth (Lv 12<sup>8</sup>), and by a leper after his cleansing (Lv 14<sup>19</sup>), there is surely survival of very ancient ideas of expiation by sacrifice. If it be said that the sin-offerings of Lv 4 only availed to expiate sin committed 'unwittingly,' and that the leper and the woman in childbirth had not sinned at all in the proper sense of the word, that is not to say that the cases provided for were not of sin in the antique sense of the word. It seems probable that in very ancient times 'sin,' such as it was conceived—ritual or moral, or both—was supposed to be expiated by sacrifice. Moreover, despite the statement of Nu 15<sup>22-31</sup> that no sacrifice could atone for deliberate transgression, the *'āshām* did make expiation for some acts which we can only describe as sinful (Lv 6<sup>1-7</sup>, He 5<sup>20-26</sup>). This would appear to be a survival from a time when sin of any kind—moral as well as ceremonial uncleanness—might be atoned for by sacrifice.

(b) *In the Developed Sacrificial System of Leviticus*.—In the developed Levitical system two ideas are prominent, namely, that sacrifices are gifts, and



that they expiate. Even the *shelem* is *qorbān* (Lv 3<sup>1</sup>), and the *‘ôlâ* is said to expiate (*kappēr*, Lv 1<sup>4</sup>). In Ezk 45<sup>15-17</sup> the meal-offering, and the burnt-offering, and the peace-offerings, as well as the sin-offering, are said to make expiation for the house of Israel. As Gray put it: 'broadly speaking, the sacrificial system as a whole is expiatory . . . but the expiatory virtue was more directly and explicitly connected in the law and was probably in life more strongly felt in connection with some sacrifices than with others' (*op. cit.*, 76). At the same time, the belief that sacrifice could atone for conscious wrong-doing was, as we have already noted, practically eliminated. The reasons for this are fairly clear. In early times, before the conception of sin was moralized, sin was mainly of the nature of ceremonial uncleanness, something for which man's will was not responsible. Hence, when the distinction between deliberate and unwitting sin was grasped, the sin- and guilt-offerings were associated, as for the most part they always had been, with unwitting sin, error. It is probable, too, that the prophetic polemic against sacrifice prevented the inclusion of deliberate sins in the category of those for which sacrifice could expiate. If we ask what was the relation between the two ideas of gift and expiation, the answer probably is that the gift of the sacrificial animal was supposed to make expiation.

In the sacrificial system as it was finally elaborated the idea of sacramental communion in the antique sense has fallen into the background. Such ideas as eating the god, or even eating with the god, are foreign to later Judaism. Nevertheless the idea of communion, in the broad sense, is still operative. The whole sacrificial system was a means whereby the covenant relation between Yahweh and Israel might be retained. It was not supposed that any one, conceivably a Gentile, might, by offering sacrifice, be admitted into that relationship. Sacrifice was intended rather to purge away uncleanness that would otherwise involve the breaking of a relationship already established.

(2) (a) *Did the Prophets condemn Sacrifice as such, or did they only condemn the abuse of it?*—The relevant passages are Am 4<sup>4</sup>, 5<sup>21-25</sup>, Hos 6<sup>6</sup>, Is 1<sup>10-17</sup>, Mic 6<sup>6-8</sup>, Jer 6<sup>20</sup> 7<sup>21-23</sup>. In all of them Yahweh is represented as demanding justice, and *not sacrifices at all*. In Hos 6<sup>6</sup> the parallelism requires us to understand the *min* (from) before 'burnt-offerings,' not, as in the Revised Version, as a comparative ('more than burnt-offerings'), but as a negative ('away from'—i.e. 'not burnt-

offerings at all')—so Sellin and most recent commentators. 'The more altars, the more sin,' is the terse judgment of Hosea (8<sup>11</sup>). Amos's 'Was it sacrifices and offerings that you brought to me in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?' (5<sup>25</sup>) seems to require a negative answer—again with Sellin, Weiser, and most recent commentators. Jeremiah is even more explicit: 'Thus saith Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel, Add your burnt-offerings to your sacrifices (*q'bhāhīm*), and eat flesh'—that is to say, why waste good meat, as you do when you offer burnt-offerings? Yahweh does not want it, so you may as well make an ordinary sacrifice of it, and have the benefit of eating the meat yourselves! Then the oracle continues, 'For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices: but this thing I commanded them, saying, Harken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the way that I command you, that it may be well with you' (Jer 7<sup>21-23</sup>). It is scarcely necessary to labour the point further: Yahweh 'hates,' 'loathes' their sacrifices, and He will not 'smell' in their solemn assemblies. His demand is not for sacrifice, but for justice. It seems impossible to take such language as directed only against the abuse of sacrifice, and in recent years it has become almost an article of critical orthodoxy to say that the prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries condemned sacrifice, *as such*, outright. Whether they were right in their supposition that sacrifice was not offered at all during the wilderness wanderings may be open to question. What is important is that they believed that the cultus was not essential to religion. More than that, it was a positive hindrance, and religion was better without it.

(b) *Granted that the Prophets condemned Sacrifice as such, are we to accept theirs as the last word on the subject?*—An affirmative answer to this question is not so simple as it might seem. No doubt, if we take a long view, history, in this matter as in so much else, has justified the prophets. Religion, even institutional religion, is possible without animal sacrifice. There are no blood sacrifices in Christianity. In Judaism they have been in abeyance for nearly 2000 years, and it is difficult to think that Judaism would now reinstate them, even if it had the opportunity. We should, however, consider that Christianity has a doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Christ; while in Judaism it was necessity, rather than choice, that first occasioned the cessation of the sacrificial system.



The prophets condemned sacrifice, doubtless. But were they discussing the question *in the abstract*? Or, were they only condemning the system as they *knew it*, with its fatuous assumption that Yahweh could be bribed with gifts of slain animals, which, besides, gave the unjust oppressors of the poor abundant opportunity for gratifying their own fleshly appetites? Did the prophets, with their threats of imminent judgment, stay to consider—as Welch puts it—that ‘there is need for festival and ritual where soul quickens soul in mutual self-dedication’? Did they consider that, ‘if it was an exaggeration to make sacrifice an essential, it may be an equal exaggeration to demand its total abolition in the interests of purity of worship’ (Welch, *Jeremiah: His Time and his Work*, 239 f.)? If they ever looked beyond exile to restoration, did they ask how the religious life of the nation would be organized—if organized it needed to be—or consider that, in the circumstances immediately following the Exile, it would be impossible to eliminate sacrifice altogether? And if they had witnessed the pathetically eager and sin-conscious sacrificial exercises of post-exilic times, with their emphasis on *ḥaṭṭāth* and *’āshām* and expiation, would they have been as scornful and uncompromising as they were in their own earlier day? It is difficult to believe that they would. We must not forget that the only sacrifices they witnessed were at such sanctuaries as Bethel and Gilgal, and at Jerusalem before the Deuteronomic reformation. This was a very different thing from the solemn and controlled ritual of the Second Temple.

We may grant that the prophetic objection to sacrifice, once it has been uttered, is absolute (cf. Jn 4<sup>20-24</sup>), that no matter what the motives underlying it may be, animal sacrifice is a revolting business, and is neither here nor there so far as the highest religion is concerned. Nevertheless, in the circumstances, the system continued for some hundreds of years longer, and we have no right to charge Ezekiel and his collaborators with apostasy. And during the period of the Second Temple there were those, both in Palestine and in the Diaspora, who reached something like the prophetic standpoint, not by denying outright the utility of sacrifice, but by pursuing the sacrificial idea of expiation by gifts to its ultimate and logical conclusion.

Thus, it must in time become obvious that God is not any better off for all the gifts that men may offer to Him. ‘All things come of thee, and of thine own have we given thee’ (1 Ch 29<sup>14</sup>). The emphasis thus comes to be shifted from what God gains by sacrifice to what man loses by it. Until

at last, following the gift idea to its conclusion, it is realized that the most acceptable gift that man can offer is the gift of a holy life, of himself (cf. Gray, *op. cit.*, 43-49). Specially worthy of note are certain passages in the Psalms, namely, 40<sup>6-9</sup> 50<sup>7-15</sup> 51<sup>16</sup>. 17 69<sup>30</sup>. 31 (English Version). These are ‘erratic blocks’ embedded in a book which on the whole has a different attitude towards sacrifice. Yet although they may well have owed their inspiration to the prophets, they are not, with the exception of Ps 50, polemical in quite the same uncompromising way as the prophets had been. They are the utterances of men who have learned to spiritualize the whole conception of sacrifice rather than of men who are impatient of sacrifice to the point of loathing it. They had accompanied animal sacrifice with the sacrifice of thanksgiving and of a humble and contrite heart, until at length the spiritual has come to take the place of the animal sacrifice (cf. Gunkel, *Einleitung in die Psalmen*, 277 f., 366, 375 f.). A similar attitude may be observed among Jews of the Diaspora. This was the more easy for them, since it was only occasionally that they could participate in the sacrificial ritual at Jerusalem. Philo contrasts the altar of incense—symbolical of the ascending prayers of the faithful—with the altar of burnt-offering, much to the disadvantage of the latter (Gray, *op. cit.*, 145 f.). Thus at length, trial once more having been made of approach to God by sacrifice, men reached, as in the course of history they so often have done, by toilsome climbing, those heights to which the prophets on wings of faith and intuition had long before preceded them.

(3) *If the idea at the heart of Sacrifice has any validity, has it any contribution to make to the Christian doctrine of the Atonement?*—We must conclude from the foregoing that it is a mistake to regard sacrifice simply as a revoltingly ugly business that contributed nothing to the development of true religion. It occupies too large a place in the history of religion, both within and outside Judaism, to be dismissed in such summary fashion. If we can dispense with sacrifice it is because we have a doctrine of the perfect sacrifice of Christ offered once for all. If the sacrificial system is done away in Christ, it is because He fulfilled the ideas which found expression in it. This is sound New Testament doctrine, for quite frequently in the New Testament sacrificial language is used in reference to the death of Christ.

To continue from where we left off in the preceding section: to give one’s self utterly to God is anything but easy; and only those who have



succeeded in making the offering know how poor it is even when it has been made. Can any man be satisfied that he has adequately purchased his acceptance with God? We may easily, in our enthusiasm for Jeremiah's and Ezekiel's discovery of the individual, forget that God still had relations with the community, that sacrifices were still offered on behalf of the community. Whitehead's definition of religion as 'What the individual does with his own solitariness' is suggestive, and true so far as it goes. But it is by no means the whole truth of the matter. It is the testimony of those who know best that no man can save himself, and, despite our modern repugnance to theories of penal substitution, it is not preposterous to suppose that Christ offered for the individual, and for the race, that perfect offering which neither is competent to offer alone.

How that offering should be further defined it is

not the business of the Old Testament scholar to suggest. His only concern is with prolegomena. Nevertheless, if the Jewish sacrificial system was in any sense a *praeparatio evangelica* we must rule out as inadequate any conception of the death of Christ which would so empty it of real theological content as to make it simply a demonstration of the principle of non-resistance to evil. Inadequate, too, is the theory that the Cross was nothing more than a revelation of the love of God. Doubtless it was that, even within the ambit of Old Testament sacrificial conceptions. 'All things come of thee. . . .' But man had some part in it too. It was the perfect offering, by and on behalf of man, by a Man who was at once both Priest and Sacrifice. Therefore do we sing, in the service of Communion :

We here present, we here spread forth to Thee  
That only offering perfect in Thine eyes,  
The one true, pure, immortal sacrifice.

---

## Literature.

### *BRAVE, NEW WORLD.*

THE lot of a prophet has always been a hard one, but never more hard than in this troubled age. In *The Coming Civilization*, by Mr. Kenneth Ingram (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), we have a serious attempt to foresee the social order of the future, and to describe some of its principal features. It is a gallant attempt, all the more so because of the conviction of its author that religion will not only survive the decay of our present capitalistic institutions, but will shape the moulds into which the new age will flow.

Few will disagree with his diagnosis of the weakness of present-day capitalism, as a competitive economic system. But we simply do not have the materials for an estimate of the future. Before the days of the Wesleys it seemed that nothing could save England from destruction. To-day the structure of our social institutions is being modified so rapidly and so radically that, apart altogether from the possibility of a great religious revival, 'the coming civilization' is scarcely within the ken even of a prophet. We must wait upon the events, and meantime 'preserve the appearances,' walking by faith and not by sight, or foresight.

For instance, when this or any other writer speaks

of 'capitalism' one is tempted to ask, is it industrialism he means, or pre-war capitalism, or our present disorders? 'Capitalism is a system under which society tends to be divided sharply into two classes' (p. 32). This is so in very varying degrees in different lands, and at different times. Marx's analysis of the economic structure of our European civilization was in many respects sound, but his predictions as to its future development have been woefully wide of the actual course of events. Mr. Ingram illustrates the way in which the new order will come by a simple little parable, in which butchers in competition cut one another's throats, then butchers in combination dictate to the community, and ultimately butchers, bakers, and candlestick-makers are forced into a system of public ownership and control. And so dawns the 'brave, new world,' which, he says, 'might be an improvement'!

After deciding that this 'coming civilization' will not be capitalistic, but a planned economy, with the motive of profit eliminated, the book goes on to an examination of materialism, and decides that Christianity in some form will be necessary to the new order, although many of its institutional forms and observances will perish with the capitalistic order, to which alone they are appropriate.



The writer shares with many others the belief that we are on the brink of a new spiritual reformation. He believes that Christianity can survive this revolution as it survived the previous Reformation, but only at the cost of changes as drastic as the religious, political, social, and economic changes when feudalism gave place to industrialism. 'Protestantism undoubtedly spread because a moral justification was required for the advent of individualistic capitalism and the open market. But to say that the open market created Protestantism is to leap to a nonsensical extreme' (p. 133). There is a school of thought which maintains on the contrary that Protestantism has created capitalism, and that our present ills are the inevitable retribution for the Reformation, and the proof of the moral and social failure of Protestantism. This is an even more 'nonsensical extreme.' More probably we are to-day witnessing, not the nemesis of the Reformation, but the exhaustion of the Renaissance in present-day industrialism, humanism, and secularism. Mr. Ingram believes that 'the materialistic attack on religion is an invitation to the human race to commit intellectual suicide' (p. 205), and that materialism can produce only static and authoritarian States of the corporative or communistic order, but even communism, in spite of its religious idealism, 'cannot make people good,' and real religion is required to provide a moral basis for the 'coming civilization.'

The book is well written, and easy to read, though the writer should have avoided the use of the phrase 'these kind of' on several occasions. There are interesting suggestions on various matters such as Naziism, sex, and prayer. Whether or no we accept the writer's views as to the new order on the threshold of which we are standing, it is stimulating to follow such a refreshing optimist, who sees in the decay of our present economic world order the seeds of a new age of faith, freedom, and love.

### ADVERSUS JUDAEOS.

IN a work bearing the above title the Rev. A. Lukyn Williams, D.D., has put together what he calls a bird's-eye view of Christian Apologæ with respect to Judaism until the Renaissance (Cambridge University Press; 25s. net). It is an able fully-documented and interesting account of the endeavours of Christian writers to win Jews to Christ, or to defend Christian beliefs against Jewish arguments; and it subserves the subsidiary but important aim of demonstrating that the Christian Church did take real interest in the spiritual welfare of the Jews.

The study extends from the earliest Books of Testimonies—collections of Old Testament passages made by Christians for purposes of convincing or controverting the Jews—to the writings of Nicolas de Lyra in the fourteenth century. While Dr. Williams deals adequately with works which are familiar at least by name to the well-informed general reader, the mass of Christian Apologetic against Judaism which he adduces will surprise all but the too few scholars who have worked in this field.

Every page is supplied with explanatory footnotes or citations from a very wide range, and some of these notes are most interesting and informative. Dr. Williams points out and demonstrates that while there is, as there must be, some formal similarity among nearly all anti-Jewish treatises, for all had to use the Old Testament and many used the same passages, yet it is a complete mistake to think that all are alike or that probably one copied his predecessors. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

The Christian apologetic failed, Dr. Williams says, because the writers did not understand the Jewish attitude to their Scriptures. The letter was sacred, but the 'Midrash,' to which Christians appealed, was not, and had not the force of proof. Midrash and Haggada had benefit for devout souls, but could not be 'proof' for any doctrine.

### VOCATION.

*God and the Common Life*, by Dr. Robert Lowry Calhoun (Scribner's; 8s. 6d. net), is a book we can warmly commend. Its title gives no indication of the amplitude of its contents. Instead of being, as one might imagine, a book of practical counsels on everyday religion, it is a work of quite unusual ability and erudition which goes deeply into the problems that arise in connexion with a theistic view of the world and human life. The writer judges two questions to be basic: 'Are there in everyday life now intimations of the presence of the Living God? And if such there be, how shall we align our thinking and living with their demands?' Starting from the Reformers' doctrine that every man's daily work is his 'vocation,' he finds that modern conditions of labour have greatly obscured and brought derision upon that great conception. He appraises the strength and weakness of it and considers how we may make an approach to a revised doctrine of 'vocation' for the present day. Vocation must involve the 'systematic and persistent doing of needful work,' 'the



putting forth and development of an individual's own constituent powers,' so that he may take 'a willing contributive share in the world's work and the common life.' The question is next considered of how to fit these conceptions into the actual world. There follows a profound inquiry into the place and significance of minds in the world order, leading on to an investigation of the relation of God to His creatures. Finally there is a study, all too brief, of man's approach to God through work and worship, and of God's approach to man in revelation and co-working. These deep subjects are treated with great clearness and candour and with a modesty in statement which is most attractive. The writer gives evidence not only of wide reading but of strong, consistent, and original thinking. He offers no cut-and-dry solutions of present-day problems, but he says many things which are worthy of being pondered by all who seek to shape this world more closely in harmony with the will of God.

#### PRESBYTERIAN UNITARIANISM.

How are we to explain that very curious movement beginning in 1662 which, with comparative rapidity, swung a large proportion of English Presbyterians from Calvinism to Unitarianism? This is the problem which Miss Olive M. Griffiths attempts to expiscate in *Religion and Learning*, 'A Study in English Presbyterian Thought from 1662 to the Foundation of the Unitarian Movement' (Cambridge University Press; 12s. 6d. net). 'Before the ejections,' says Miss Griffiths, 'the presbyterians formed the most conservative and rigidly orthodox element in the Established Church; at the end of the eighteenth century, many were members of a dissenting body which refused to impose any test or creed and whose only formula was a heterodox insistence upon the single personality of God and the proper humanity of Christ.'

Ejection from the Church, she points out, had far-reaching consequences. Presbyterians were cut off from their past traditions; they were obliged to associate with 'sectaries' for whom, formerly, they had expressed great aversion; discipline could not be enforced, nor could the *Classes* (Presbyteries) meet regularly. A new examination of their tenets was thus suggested, if not necessitated; and reconsideration of ecclesiastical practice led to revision of their doctrines.

Further, the English Universities being closed to them, their students and thinkers came under 'foreign' influences, Dutch and Scottish. Holland

gave them new ideas as to the relations of the Will and the Intellect, Scottish Philosophy led them to assign to Reason a new place in the moral life. Materialistic tendencies were marked in contemporary Physiology and Psychology. Arminianism and Socinianism were influential.

Miss Griffiths expounds and gives evidence for the extent to which all such factors were potent; and has given us a book of absorbing interest and great value.

#### AMICITIAE COROLLA.

Gilbert Murray is one of the most notable figures of his generation. His name is still cherished in Scotland among those who were fortunate enough to study Greek under him at the University of Glasgow. Since he left Glasgow his fame has spread in ever-widening circles. He has not only continued to instruct and delight us through his writings on classical subjects, and more especially through his translations in verse of classical poets; he has also identified himself with vital movements of our time, such as the League of Nations.

He has attained unto threescore years and ten, and his friends have taken occasion to honour him by dedicating a number of essays to his name. His work as a scholar is celebrated in a volume on 'Greek Poetry' published by the Clarendon Press. And before us is another volume on a variety of subjects, entitled *Essays in Honour of Gilbert Murray*, published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin (12s. 6d. net). Among the contributors appear well-known names, such as those of H. A. L. Fisher, John Masefield, Sybil Thorndike, Lord Cecil, Edwyn Bevan, and D. S. Margoliouth. The contributors to this volume consist of those who would celebrate him not so much as scholar but as poet and dramatist, publicist, and critic, and their contributions are on subjects of their own.

Readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will perhaps be most interested in the essay by Lord Cecil on 'The League of Nations Union and Gilbert Murray,' that by J. L. Hammond on 'Gladstone and the League of Nations Mind,' that by D. S. Margoliouth on 'Some Problems in the "Acta Judae Thomae,"' and—if they are inclined to scientific theory—that by F. M. Cornford on 'The Invention of Space.'

The last-named writer seeks to show that the belief in infinite space as a physical fact can be traced back to the Greek philosophers of the three centuries between Thales and Euclid (600 B.C. to 300 B.C.), but no farther. Their fgment came to be imposed on science in the Euclidean era which

Einstein has brought to a close. But it is a figment so deeply engrained in common sense that we shall find it hard to assimilate the new teaching, and to think of space and time, and even the space-time continuum, as mere mental frameworks of our own construction. The post-Euclidean finite but unbounded space postulated by Einstein takes us back, says Professor Cornford, to the pre-Euclidean finite but boundless sphere of Anaximander, Parmenides, and Empedocles. 'These philosophers did not know as much mathematics as Einstein; but they had the advantage over Newton in knowing much less mathematics than Euclid.' 'The whirling of Time has brought in his revenges upon the impious assailants of spherical space.' Which are cryptic remarks, apart from their context, and for the elucidation of them we must refer our readers to the volume itself.

#### THE FATHER OF THE GODLESS.

The rise of secularism in modern Europe is an engrossing study, and in *Baron d'Holbach: A Prelude to the French Revolution*, by Mr. W. H. Wickwar, M.A. (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), one at least of its sources is laid bare. Less famous and less brilliant than his contemporaries, Rousseau and Voltaire, d'Holbach was chiefly notable for his inspiration and encouragement of materialistic writers, and for his own masterly propaganda on behalf of atheism. German by birth, a student in Holland, he afterwards settled in Paris, and became the centre or *maître d'hôtel* of the group of thinkers who produced the *Encyclopédias*, and so prepared the way for the French Revolution.

Paris in the second half of the eighteenth century was 'the coffee-house of Europe.' The list of thinkers and writers from other countries who knew and corresponded with d'Holbach includes the names of many of the most famous men of letters of the day. And it is strange that a man who exerted so wide an influence in his own day and since should be so largely unknown in ours.

'He was not the first modern atheist,' but in his own beliefs he was far more radical than either Rousseau or Voltaire. He owed much to Hobbes in psychology, and to Locke in political theory, and repaid his debt by creating the utilitarian school of ethics afterwards so prominent in Britain. He knew Hume and Adam Smith; and his works, with those he translated and fathered, helped to shape the beliefs of Godwin and Shelley. It was his 'System of Nature' that turned Goethe, as an undergraduate in Strasbourg, from a philosophic

to a poetic approach to life! He shares with Hume the credit of arousing Kant to think out a new theory of causality, and so to prepare for the new idealism in metaphysics. He contributed largely to the *Encyclopedia*, and wrote on science, ethics, social theory, and metaphysics, but his main interest, indeed his obsession, is religion. *Écrasez l'infâme* might be his motto even more than Voltaire's, for his God is singularly like the devil. To him religion is the great corrupter of morals; it brings dissension into society, and perverts politics. 'The thesis with which he made history . . . was in brief that the history and experience of humanity had proved the moral uselessness and political danger, as well as the scientific falsity, attendant on all supernatural religion, but that in the light of that experience it was now possible to substitute for it a system of belief that would be truer to nature and more useful to man and society.' For him, of course, religion was a bad mixture of superstition and priestcraft. This explains his affinity with thought in Russia, for he did for the French Revolution what the 'godless' are trying to do for Communism. Finding religion hopelessly entangled with a corrupt form of government, he tries to destroy both because of their unholy alliance. 'He was practically the first free-thinker to admit the right of rebellion, a right which non-Christians had hitherto and for good reason been inclined to associate with religious fanaticism and disorder.' As the declared enemy of despotism and absolutism in Church and State, his influence was strongly in favour of revolution, and his own leanings towards constitutionalism failed to find much support in an age when his adopted country was already on the edge of the abyss.

The book is fully and carefully documented, exhaustive and well-written. Perhaps its method of construction leads to a somewhat wooden and departmental view of this exceedingly supple and versatile man. Although the part he played in history and in thought is notable rather than noble, and the main motive of his life was an unfortunate prejudice against religion because of the unworthy forms of it most conspicuous in his time, it is good to have in English so competent an account and estimate of this remarkable man.

#### THE BOOK OF RUTH

Roman Catholic scholars on the Continent have long been making valuable contributions to Biblical studies, but it is only in the last few years



that their English colleagues have begun to give us serious studies in the Old Testament. *The Old Testament: The Book of Ruth*, by the Rev. J. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., is the second Old Testament volume to appear in the 'Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures,' of which Father Lattey is the general editor (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). The first volume, on the Book of Malachi, was also from his pen, and we may expect others from different scholars in the near future. The greater part of the book consists of the Introduction, which includes a careful study of the Hebrew God and His functions; text and notes follow. The translation is original, but departs as little as possible from that with which English readers are familiar.

Father Lattey's work should be of particular interest to Protestant readers, as indicating some of the best features of the Roman Church in England. We may note in the first place his general outlook, which is conservative without being Fundamentalist. This is evident in his reluctance (not refusal) to emend the text, and in his desire to throw the book back to the earliest possible date. Next we may call attention to the high standard of scholarship maintained by the author; he is not only an accomplished Hebraist, but he has studied, and does not fear to use, the best of recent work, both Catholic and Protestant. True, he sometimes (for example on 2) adopts an explanation of the text which some of his readers would hardly accept, but in such cases he is often influenced by his conservative tendencies. And, like most commentators, he fails to appreciate the true significance of Ruth's words at the end of 1<sup>17</sup>, 'Thus may Jehovah do to me, and more also, if aught but death part thee and me.' Ruth has just said that she will die and be buried with Naomi—surely the simplest rendering of the Hebrew is 'if *even* death part me and thee'? Finally, we cannot miss the strong religious, almost evangelical, note which runs through the whole. Again, some readers will feel that his deeply spiritual instincts have carried Father Lattey too far when he suggests that Ruth's willingness to adopt Naomi's God implies a real conversion from a lower religion to a higher, but we would rather have this tendency than its opposite. Such work as this helps us to realize that, while formal reunion between the two great branches of the Western Church may not yet be in sight, we have at least the possibility—and more than the possibility—of sympathetic co-operation between its members in the study of the Old Testament.

The Greek statesman who held that no man should be accounted happy until he was dead would no-doubt have deprecated the writing of biographies of living men. Yet there are cases where such a thing seems inevitable, as when an impressive personality appears or when great public interest is awakened in a man's career. It may be granted that Schweitzer has such a personality and career, and much has already been written both by him and about him. The latest book, *Albert Schweitzer: A Biography*, by Mr. Magnus C. Ratter (Allenson; 7s. 6d. net), while it contains much that is of value, cannot without serious qualification be commended. The writer is carried away by his enthusiasm and indulges in laudations which are beyond measure extravagant. The reader is given the impression that Schweitzer combines in himself the excellences of all the great men who ever lived. He is freely compared with the greatest figures in history from Buddha and St. Paul downwards. As a prophet he is matched with the most notable from Amos to John the Baptist; as a saint he excels Francis; as an artist in words he has inherited the mantle of Goethe; he is the Newton of morality, the Socrates of our age. This becomes terribly wearisome and instead of attracting repels, instead of stirring enthusiasm wakens criticism and a sense of surfeit. The book is divided into two parts. The first and shorter gives an account of Schweitzer's life; the second gives an outline of his teaching on philosophy, religion, and music. This latter part is much the more valuable, giving as it does a convenient compendium of Schweitzer's religious and philosophic views. It should also be useful in indicating to those who are acquainted only with Schweitzer's missionary work that his creed in some important respects comes short of the fullness of the Christian faith.

It is astonishing what errors regarding the Authorized Version of 1611 still find credence. Professor Edgar J. Goodspeed exposes some of the most persistent of these in an interesting essay, *The Translators to the Reader* (Cambridge University Press; 2s. 3d.). In it he also republishes the famous Preface to King James Version, which is now so often omitted, and says: 'For my part, I know of no greater service that can be done to Biblical study to-day than to put back the King James Preface into its rightful place, in every copy of that great version, to the understanding of which it is so indispensable.'

*Odds and Ends*, by Mr. Vernon Gibberd (James

Clarke; 2s. 6d. net), contains about thirty brief addresses to children. The title was suggested by the happy remarks of a little girl who had listened to some of these addresses, and who, on being asked what the speaker had been talking about, replied, 'Oh, just odds and ends.' These addresses might be called lay sermons for little folk. They are not specially Biblical, though full of wholesome moral and religious teaching. They touch on a wide variety of topics and are lit up with gleams of subtle humour. They make interesting reading, and should supply a wealth of suggestion for children's sermons.

The Pastoral Address of the Methodist Conference of 1935 stated that 'the value of the Church in human society forces us to restate in a changed world the doctrine of the Church as Methodists think of it. The universal and the denominational should be placed in their proper relationships in thought and meaning. Our young people need this.' Conscious of this need, Dr. A. W. Harrison has written two essays on *Church and Sacraments* (Epworth Press; 2s. net), in which he treats his subject from the Nonconformist point of view. He has little difficulty in showing that the early Methodists held 'no mean conception of the Church, indeed it was the highest of High Church doctrine.' He concludes that 'reunited Methodism in co-operation with all who hold the Head, has a great mission in presenting to men the beauty and abiding worth of the greatest institution in the world, the Church of the Living God.' In the essay on the Lord's Supper he deals principally with 'the Free Church interpretation from the Reformation to the present day.' This is a field which has not been sufficiently cultivated, and Dr. Harrison's contribution is all the more valuable. He finds that the great Reformers and Nonconformist leaders have held a high doctrine of the Sacrament and have maintained a profound unity of spirit. 'In reviewing the different customs and ideas of the Free Churches as they have approached the Lord's Table, it is the unity of doctrine and of spirit that is far more impressive than their diversity. We find differences of posture adopted, frequent and infrequent communions, the use and the disuse of a liturgy, but when we come to ask the question, "What mean ye by this service?" nearly all the differences disappear.'

The Epworth Press has published a volume of children's sermons by the Rev. Albert J. Matthews, who is already known by his contributions to

'*Virginibus Puerisque*'—indeed, two of the addresses in this volume are reprinted from THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. Mr. Matthews has some unusual stories to tell. The first is 'At the monthly meeting of the Prestatyn Council it was alleged that someone had been deliberately tampering with the sunshine recorder on top of the "Beach Café," and had caused all the reports to be inaccurate. The Meteorological (what a fearful word) Officer said he was sure that the miscreant was a seagull, which had possibly alighted on the glass bowl covering the instrument, and a slight kick given as it flew away, would be sufficient to move the sensitive crystal out of position.'

Mr. Matthews can not only tell good stories but he can also draw the lessons from them. The gull did not stop the sunshine; he only prevented it from being registered. God sends the sunshine but so many people prevent it from being registered. A word may do it or an act. 'From a hillside I watched some little boys play cricket. They were having such a happy time. Then I saw an older boy cross the field. He walked up to the stumps, pulled them out of the ground and moved across the meadow with them under his arm.' The volume is to be heartily commended. The title is *Stealing the Sunshine* (2s. 6d. net).

*This Our Pilgrimage*, by Canon Peter Green, M.A. (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net), is a little treasure. Everything that Canon Green writes is fresh and pointed, but he has written nothing better than these 'thoughts on the Christian life.' Realizing that world welfare is bound up with the prosperity of the Kingdom of God, he is deeply concerned at the thought that what Christians are offering the world 'is not good enough, not full enough, not such as Christ would have us offer.' In particular there is a shifting of interest from the eternal to the temporal. Accordingly he has written this little book for the encouragement and guidance of pilgrims on the heavenward way. It is in the form of short Bible readings, but it has a strong vein of reasoned Christian thought running through it, and it is enriched by many illustrative incidents, mostly drawn from the Canon's own wide experience.

A cheaper edition of *The Problem of Right Conduct*, by Canon Peter Green, M.A. (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), is very cordially to be welcomed. The book is one of the sanest and most practical textbooks on Christian Ethics that we know of, and it is gratifying that the continued demand for it has brought out this new edition. Clergymen, religious



and social workers, as well as parents and teachers, will find here the living problems of to-day treated with great wisdom and sound sense in complete loyalty to the mind of Christ.

For the past thirty years the Bishop of London has arranged annually the publication of a book for Lent from the pen of some competent writer of the Church of England. This year, by a very happy arrangement, the Lenten book is composed of the most striking chapters selected from previous volumes of the series. Its title is *Religion in Life* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). Each chapter is by a different writer. There are ten in all, and they include such names as the Archbishop of York, Bishop Brent, Dean Inge, the Revs. Studdert Kennedy, W. P. G. McCormick, and G. F. Holden. The various subjects have been very skilfully chosen and arranged so that the book has a real unity. It provides most attractive and profitable reading for the Lenten, or indeed for any, season.

For those who take prayer seriously, and for whom it is the supreme activity of the spiritual life, there will be both comfort and stimulus in a little book called *Worship and Intercession*, by Miss Ruth Hardy, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P. (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). The author is a doctor in the mission field, and, being a busy woman herself, she aims at showing how even for busy people an 'intercessory attitude' is possible, and how natural it is as a spiritual activity for all who are trying to live 'as part of Christ's Body.' The book is a deeply earnest and intelligent plea for such a habit of intercession. Some of the titles of the chapters are 'Towards God,' 'Liberty of the Soul,' 'Ever-present Aids,' and there is an appendix with a table of subjects for each day in the week.

*The Whited Sepulchre*, by Carlo von Kùgelgen (Lutterworth Press; 2s. net and 3s. 6d. net), may be literally described as a terrible book. It is called 'an authentic account of church persecution in Russia,' and the author in his preface says: 'I can vouch on my honour for the truth of this moving testimony which has reached me across two continents.' The contents of the book are so horrible that one is reluctant to believe that they can be true. Yet there is no real reason to doubt the fact. The book is the personal narrative by a pastor in Russia of his sufferings, or rather his tortures, at the hands of Soviet officials, simply because of his religious profession. The account of the gaol conditions, of slave work, and, worst of all, of

the 'third-degree' interrogation, which was tenth-degree, if there be anything worse than third, is so distressing that one wonders as one reads if there can be in this world such brutal animals as these Soviet torturers. The heroism, unconsciously revealed in the narrative, of this pastor and his wife is very moving. A word of praise must be given to the translator from the original German, Miss L. M. Stalker. The book is so beautifully rendered into English that one would not imagine that it is not simply an English work.

The importance of religious education in the day school is being increasingly recognized by leading educationists. It is true that the practice of it by no means corresponds to the theory. All the more urgent is it that the duty should be advocated and the subject ventilated as widely as possible. A word of warm welcome is therefore due to *Theology in the Schools: Its Need and Scope*, by Mr. A. C. Toyne, M.A. (Lutterworth Press; 1s. net). Mr. Toyne does not mean by 'theology' creeds or dogmas but spiritual teaching. He rightly stresses the fact that teaching 'scripture,' in the sense of the mere 'facts' of the Bible history, is not religious education at all, and in this little book he urges the practice of something much more worthy of the name. It may be said without qualification that he makes out an unanswerable case. If teachers could be induced to read his book with an open mind, the cause of religious training would be definitely advanced.

*The Inspiration of the Bible*, by the Rev. R. H. Malden (Milford; 3s. 6d. net), contains a series of Cathedral lectures given by the Dean of Wells during Lent, 1935. He has felt that there are many people who, for various reasons, are unable to study the Bible carefully for themselves, and are inclined to think that its value, its inspiration, and its truth are bound up with the literal and verbal accuracy of every statement made in it. He finds this opinion both among Fundamentalists and among Agnostics, and it is his purpose to do what he can to correct so erroneous a view. After an introductory chapter, in which he explains what the Church means by 'inspiration' when the term is used of Scripture, he gives a brief outline sketch of the contents of the Old Testament, and appends two final chapters on certain typical difficulties with which readers are often faced. While his information as to the progress of Old Testament studies is not always up to date, he writes from a thoroughly modern standpoint, and his simple and

clear statement of his case should prove of real value to honest readers who have been disturbed by the apparent upheaval of faith produced by the newer outlook.

A reprint has been issued of *The Contendings of the Apostles*, 'Being the Histories of the Lives and Martyrdoms of the Twelve Apostles and Evangelists,' which the late Sir E. A. Wallis Budge translated from Ethiopic MSS in the British Museum and issued in 1901 (Milford; 12s. 6d. net). The Ethiopic version of the *Acta* was made probably about the fourteenth century; but much of the material is centuries older, having passed from an original Coptic through Arabic and Syriac. The main interest of the work lies just in its representative character as an example of Coptic and Ethiopic religious romance. That any considerable part of it embodies credible tradition, few will be prepared to say.

A sane and very helpful book on the Apocalypse has been written by the Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, the Rev. H. L. Goudge, D.D., *The Apocalypse and the Present Age* (Mowbray; 2s. net). Dr. Goudge is not concerned mainly with questions of authorship or date, though he discusses them briefly in his first lecture. His subject is the meaning of the book, and he makes the startling statement in his preface that when once we understand its symbolism, it is, so far as its practical teaching is concerned, 'one of the easiest books of the New Testament,' though, he adds, it bristles with difficulties in detail, many of which are at present insoluble. These difficulties, however, do not affect the practical understanding of the book, and he does not pay too much attention to them.

The real point of this book is that an apocalypse appears in an age of darkness and despair, when things are wrong and no expectation can be cherished of betterment from any human institution. At such a time the hope of Divine intervention springs up in the believing mind as the one source of deliverance. Our age may not unfitly be said to be wandering in the dark, and in such a time as ours the Apocalypse, which brought light in darkness before, has a message which we need to hear. This Dr. Goudge expounds with both learning and insight. It is a great gain to have a book like the Apocalypse handled with such sanity and suggestiveness.

The Alcuin Club has done great service to the Church by its numerous scholarly tracts, and their

new publication, issued through Messrs. A. R. Mowbray, is no exception. It is called *A Server's Manual for the Holy Communion* (1s. 9d. net). It is clear in its instruction and balanced in its churchmanship, and being an Alcuin book it is beautifully presented. We can recommend this small manual with confidence as one which is really loyal to the ceremonial of the Church of England.

*Bible and Spade* is the title of a new book on Biblical archæology by the Rev. Stephen L. Caiger, B.D. The author modestly protects himself by declaring that it is written for the layman and not for the specialist, but as the Bishop of Bradford says in the Introduction, it is a book which supplies a real need. It is a review of the Old Testament story in the light of modern excavations. The author makes no pretence to any original research. A wide reader, the possessor of a clear mind and with a gift of arrangement, he has collected and marshalled the results of the excavator from Napoleon's time to the present day. He has selected his authorities with discretion, and has succeeded in presenting a very clear outline which should be of particular value to teachers. At the end of the hundred and eighty-eight octavo pages are some extraordinarily good appendices which will be found most clarifying to those who are confused in their chronology and in their estimate of authority. There are twenty excellent half-tone plates which have been selected from larger publications. The book is published by the Oxford University Press at 5s. net. It is worth more.

*The Essentials of Life*, by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. (Pickering & Inglis; 1s. net), contains eight simple gospel addresses by one who was an expert in expository preaching. They deal with the fundamentals of the faith and should prove helpful to seekers after salvation. The little book is warmly commended in a foreword by the Rev. J. Russell Howden, and it will doubtless be welcomed by many who have heard the author at Keswick and elsewhere in England. It will revive the memory of an honoured voice now silent.

An excellent addition to the 'Library of Romance' has been made under the title of *The Romance of Modern Pathfinders*, by Mr. Norman J. Davidson, B.A. (Seeley, Service; 6s. net). It is just the kind of book to fire a boy's imagination. At the same time it is full of first-hand information about strange lands and peoples, for it gives the pith of eight or nine books of travel in remote regions by



authors of repute. The reader is led from Baffin Land to the Upper Amazon, and from Ashanti to Kamchatka. There is no weariness on the road, for the whole is one long panorama of strange lands and stranger creatures—humans, birds, beasts, and insects. About two dozen fine illustrations add to the attractiveness and value of the book.

We note a new and enlarged edition of *Folk-Lore of the Holy Land, Moslem, Christian, and Jewish*, by the Rev. J. E. Hanauer (Sheldon Press; 10s. 6d. net), originally published in 1907. While it would be difficult to fit it into any department of theology, its republication will be welcomed by theologians of every department. The first impression it leaves on us is that of the extraordinary medley presented by modern Palestine. Here we have a large number of stories, some familiar, some new, some peculiar to Palestine, some belonging to a world-wide treasury of folklore. At times we find ourselves in the atmosphere of the Arabian Nights, at times we are in the Talmud, and at others, again, we feel that we are reading extracts from a mediæval religious romance.

Collections of stories are apt to become dull before we reach the end. How many of us can read Æsop or Grimm straight through? It is no small achievement on Canon Hanauer's part to have built up, out of the extraordinary mixture of material, a book which we can read from cover to cover with pleasure. It may be that the arrangement helps the book, for the stories are classified according to their subject-matter. But the chief credit must go to the author's skilful choice of stories, and to the charming form in which they are presented. It is, indeed, a delightful book.

Recently there was formed an 'Institute of Christian Education,' with well-known people in the religious and educational worlds at the head of it. One of its immediate fruits is a brief survey of religious education in three selected spheres—Tropical Africa, India, and China. The objects of this survey, published under the title *Christian Education Overseas*, and written by Mr. A. V. Murray, Mr. F. F. Monk, and Mr. Ronald Rees (S.C.M.; 1s. net), are two: first, to show the

necessity of shaping the rising national spirit of these countries by the truth and grace that are in Christ; and second, to show the rich opportunity that exists in these lands for teachers of the right stamp. In a foreword Viscount Halifax points out that Christian education is the only safeguard against the dangers which inevitably arise from the contact of traditional systems with Western materialism.

The Universal Christian Council for Life and Work, the product of the 'Stockholm Movement,' is calling a conference of the Churches to meet at Oxford in 1937 in order to consider some of the subjects which are fundamental to the life and welfare of Christianity at the present time. 'It will be an attempt to state the meaning of Christianity in the conditions of the world to-day, and to enable the churches corporately to face the attacks which are being made by materialism and paganism.' This sentence is taken from the preface to a little book, *Loyalties to Church and State*, by Mr. H. W. Fox, Honorary Secretary of the British Council of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net). The book is intended to assist in the preparatory study which is being undertaken by experts, and by humbler people in groups. The subjects discussed are Man, the Community, the Church and the State, and questions for study groups are added to each chapter. The book is an able and thought-provoking one, and is well calculated to achieve its object.

Dr. John R. Mott has written a valuable paper on *Co-operation and the World Mission* (S.C.M.; 2s. net). The main points in his argument are that co-operation in missionary work has come to a parting of the ways where it is faced with the alternatives of advance or retreat, and that wider and closer co-operation is indispensable and urgent. The secrets of successful co-operation are carefully considered as well as the causes which have led to failure. No one is more competent to treat of this whole subject than Dr. Mott, and he brings to it an unrivalled experience and great soundness of judgment.

## Experiments in Christian Service.

### V. The Social Service of the Salvation Army.

BY MRS. BRAMWELL BOOTH, HADLEY WOOD, BARNET.

IN 1911 the Founder and first General of the Salvation Army called together a council of officers engaged in directing our Social Work, drawn from many countries of the world. Speaking to them at the first session, he said: 'By the Social Work I mean those operations of the Salvation Army which have to do with the alleviation or removal of the moral and temporal evils which cause so much of the misery of the submerged classes and which so greatly hinder their salvation.'

Twenty-one years before this, William Booth had published his book, *In Darkest England and the Way Out*, which announced his intention of enlarging the scope of this work already tentatively begun, by setting apart more officers to help those whom he described as 'the submerged tenth,' those who, because of vice or misfortune, had lost their 'foothold in society.' In 1890 when he wrote, no provision was made for those who were out of work beyond the poor law relief, which necessitated in most cases the break-up of the home and the separation of the family. This was shunned by the honest poor, who dreaded 'the House.' Deaths through starvation were of frequent occurrence. In the first chapter of his book, William Booth wrote: 'We venture to hope that in the future every honest worker on English soil will be as warmly clad, as healthily housed and as regularly fed as our criminal convicts—but that is not yet.' And we can still say 'that is not yet,' for while prison diet and accommodation has been improved, we may even say perfected, the housing conditions in many districts are deplorable, and the accommodation of some quite respectable families with six or seven children is miserably inadequate.

During the next twenty years some of General William Booth's hopes were realized and the Social Work of the Salvation Army was extended not only in Great Britain but throughout the Empire, the United States of America, Europe, and the East. The social enterprises included many differing activities for the relief of misery, including work among the starving, drunkards, paupers, unemployed, homeless, criminals, and outcast women, and also international slum and rescue work, emigration schemes, homes for the aged, farm colonies and small-holdings. By 1911, 954 social

institutions, with accommodation for 35,000 people, had come into being.

A second international Social Council was held in 1921 by my husband, who succeeded his father in 1912. The decade had witnessed a remarkable extension of this work. This increased activity and particularly the phenomenal success realized in thousands of individual cases of the outcast and vicious bore witness to the soundness of the principles underlying the work. When General Bramwell Booth was called home to God in 1929, the accommodation in the institutions was for over 80,000 souls.

The mistakes, which by experience and observation we learned to avoid, still need guarding against to-day. The advice given by the Founder and the rules which were drawn up by his son, General Bramwell Booth, still constitute the main lines on which the work is conducted. Of these I mention two or three directions which we regard as fundamental to all such work.

I. The co-operation of the individual must be secured if any permanent success is to result from efforts to assist them. During the first days of the Rescue Work in 1883 I realized after my inspection of several penitentiaries that the chief cause of failure (and without exception failure was confessed) lay in the reliance placed upon bolts and bars and in the length of time spent in residence. Matrons mourned over many women and girls, whose conduct while under their care for two and three years had been exemplary, but who succumbed within a short interval to former temptations when at liberty. I learned that the only compulsion which could usefully prevail was the compulsion of a loving sympathy which reached the heart. Any other power which endeavoured to coerce their will increased rather than lessened the difficulty of dealing with them.

The co-operation of those who are committed to our care from the Police Courts and are legally bound over to remain a certain length of time is not easily obtained, but, where these cases are but few and the atmosphere of the home is one of freedom, where the inmates understand that an opportunity will be given to each one to prove herself outside as soon as it is considered advisable,



the sense of coercion is lessened, and frequently these special cases are willing to remain with us beyond the term for which they are committed when we show them the need for so doing.

To secure such an atmosphere the oversight in the home must be efficient. The presence of an officer—interested in them as individuals while at work or at play, and taking meals with them to lead the conversation into useful and entertaining channels—I consider essential.

Securing the co-operation of the individual means also fostering their independence. I think that one of the dangers in Social Work of the present day is to place too much reliance upon what money can accomplish. Mere lavish giving too often results in a weakening of self-reliance and of the right feeling of independence.

Let me illustrate again from the work for women with which I am most familiar. I found it was the usual custom to give to those who were going out to situations an outfit of clothing. Our poverty in the first years of this work made that a difficult matter for us, and I felt it best to arrange that the cost of their outfit should be defrayed by the women themselves in small monthly payments. We soon realized that our poverty had been a blessing in disguise. Some of the women had been helped to remain at their work which at first they felt to be irksome, because they did not wish to 'let the Home down' by leaving their situation before they had repaid their debt. Far from being a discouragement to them, as some had prophesied, their indebtedness proved an incentive to self-help.

II. Reliance upon Divine power is the foundation of all real success in Social Work. To minister to the physical needs of mankind while ignoring those of the soul and spirit is but to treat the man on the level of a mere animal. William Booth wrote in *In Darkest England*: 'To get a man soundly saved it is not enough to put on him a pair of new breeches, to give him regular work, or even to give him a university education. These things are all outside a man, and if the inside remains unchanged you have wasted your labour. . . . To change the nature of the individual, to get at the heart, to save his soul, is the only real lasting method of doing him any good. . . . I must assert in the most unqualified way that it is primarily and mainly for the sake of saving the soul that I seek the salvation of the body.' This aim, with which to a wonderful extent Salvation Army social workers are inspired, accounts for the modern miracles of conversion which have been seen in every land where the Salvation Army flag flies.

Men like Dan McGregor, who was once a popular young steward on a P. & O. liner, under the blow of a sudden tragic sorrow, in the death of his wife and child, took to heavy drinking and sank lower and lower. Frequently in prison, always an outcast and homeless, by the time that he was forty years of age he was as hopeless about himself as others were of him. Hungry and ill he came to a Salvation Army shelter. He was without money and very much knocked about after a fight in Seven Dials. He was fed and his wounds treated. To his own amazement he found himself saying, 'You've been kind to me. I am grateful. I am willing to work,' instead of 'Look for work? Not I. I don't believe in it.' Change of heart soon followed, and he became a trusted employee, and later was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant. As Major Dan McGregor he died in November 1935.

When Mr. Harold Begbie came to see the shelter, Dan McGregor took him to his own room under the eaves, and brought out a bundle of rags, saying, 'These are the clothes I wore the night I was saved,' then kneeling down, in that attitude told Mr. Begbie something of his experience.

Mr. Begbie listened intently, and at the close said, with earnestness, 'Now I know what the Salvation Army means by salvation.'

McGregor spoke of his conversion in an officers' meeting during the Social Council of 1911. I think all present were deeply moved, and I can never forget the loving adoration of his soul shown in his look and words as he described the revelation of the Saviour's love and power which came to him one night when he was struggling with the intolerable craving for strong drink. He was often heard to say, 'I didn't know that I had any goodness in me until they treated me as if I were human—a fellow with a soul.'

And this supernatural renewing change wrought by Divine grace is as much needed for the more respectable as for the most deeply sunken. I met a woman recently in Holloway Prison who was in very great distress. She had been convicted for shop-lifting. Amidst her sobs she said to me, 'I'm not a bad woman. We attend church regularly, and the children are in a Sunday school. My husband is a good man. I have ruined them! I have disgraced them! How cruel that I was caught the first time!' After we had talked she realized that she had never seen the need of a change of heart, or acknowledged that she was one of the sinners Christ died to save. After prayer together she could thank God that she was found out 'the first time.' We visited her home and verified the statement,

and assisted her husband to move into another district.

How much, how very much, disappointment would be avoided if the well-meaning people who give themselves to this work of succouring their fellows could realize that no amount of money poured forth, in providing for the relief of temporal necessities, can adequately meet the needs of human spirits. The change in those of whom we are thinking which will make the thieves and the dishonest honest, drunkards sober, idlers willing to work, can only proceed from within the man himself. To me it is unutterably sad to realize that, while we know the flow of benevolent activity which characterizes the present-day attitude of the authorities and of social workers and philanthropists owes its source to the influences of Christianity, rather let me say to the gospel of Jesus Christ, the real Author of true philanthropy is often not acknowledged nor His help sought. Difficult cases are not told of the One who gave His life for them, of the One who alone can forgive sin and deliver from sin. The eager social worker too often forgets the words Christ spoke, 'Without me ye can do nothing.'

A well-known writer of the last century expresses the truth we need to heed to-day :

'The gospel of Jesus Christ is the only means which has ever been found adequate to the work of subduing human passions, and securing to a community the blessings of comfort and peace.'

His statement is pre-eminently true of work for the misfits, for the unfortunate, and for the vicious members of society. In the light of this thought, the present removal and rebuilding of the slum areas without making adequate provision for churches, even rooms for educational facilities, apart from the ordinary schools, is very disconcerting. Houses, for instance, have recently been erected by County Councils in new districts, which will accommodate thousands of people, but with absolutely no provision for places of worship.

III. In the endeavour to help criminals and also young people who have gone astray, too much reliance is often placed upon the remedial influence of time—indeed, can such influence be attributed to the mere passage of time? Fifty years ago it was thought impossible to rescue prostitutes unless they had been shut away from normal life for two or three years. I satisfied myself that this was a mistake on two grounds. First, that no mere change of circumstances can bring about a

change of character. No imprisonment, however long, can make the dishonest man honest. I found it most important that as soon as any real desire to be good had awakened in the individual that the earliest opportunity should be found to allow them to carry out their good intentions. In this way no fixed term of residence in the home was arranged. We found that in some cases two or three months was sufficient for us to acquire knowledge of their character, and that they could be trusted to go from under our roof to 'prove themselves.'

The second reason was the fact that a number of the younger women whom we found living on the streets, and who came to us, had been *brought up* in orphanages and institutions. Some of these had only been a few months at liberty in the rough and tumble of the world before they were ruined and outcast. After careful inquiry into the details of their history, it became clear to me that the rigid institutional life had almost destroyed their independence of will. A time for everything and everything to its time; a place for everything and everything in its place; no private ownership of property; very little opportunity to choose between good and evil because what was supposed to be best was forced upon them every time; thus their independence of will was practically lost, and with it the power to resist temptation.

In this connexion I greatly deplore the tendency to prefer long to shorter sentences of imprisonment for young people. The long sentence for hardened criminals is a matter of necessity for the protection of society. I think the preventive detention sentence may produce good result in that, when prisoners have made themselves liable to this by the number of their convictions, they will realize that a further conviction may earn for them an eight years' sentence. This will act as a deterrent. But the idea that long imprisonment, whether it is served in prison or in a Borstal Institution or an approved home, is in itself beneficial to the young is, I am convinced, quite wrong. Punishment and reform are two different processes. My husband, General Bramwell Booth, said: 'There is a morbid feeling against punishment—but it is God's system.'

It is important to distinguish between the right of the Law to punish and the tendency to inflict punishment, or its equivalent, in the hope of reformation. It has been well said, 'Society has no right to send a man to gaol merely because society thinks that discipline of this kind would do him good. He must deserve the punishment or the law has no right to punish him.' Three years in



the formative period, from fifteen to twenty-one years, is a very long time in a young person's life. It is unjust to sentence them to long terms of deprivation of liberty because it is hoped to reform them by so doing.

Punishment is necessary. The human being who does wrong expects to be punished; and the almost universal practice of letting young people when first convicted (which seldom follows their first offence) escape imprisonment has encouraged many in dishonesty, and has brought some young people under evil influences since those older in vice have used them as pawns, counting on this fact. Dr. Johnson's words might well be considered by some of the magistrates and even by judges who pronounce sentence on the young people of to-day. He said :

'Every just law is dictated by reason. The practice of every legal court is regulated by equity. It is the quality of reason to be invariable and constant, and of equity to give to one man what in the same case is given to another.'

But to-day sentences of three years are frequently given to young people who have committed offences which, had they been older, could only have incurred sentences of six months at most. That these are served in Borstal Institutions or approved homes does not alter the principle.

Present-day conditions in some ways have made relief work more difficult. The responsibility for the unemployed now accepted by the Government has superseded voluntary work for them in some cases. This is regrettable, for voluntary work, which results from the flow of human sympathy and individual effort, holds blessing for both giver and receiver, is less open to abuse, encroaches less on a man's sense of independence and (so far as my own experience goes) is more economical.

It is very difficult not to feel that the millions that have been and will be spent upon the dole could not have been laid out to better advantage for the individuals concerned. 'The brilliant story' of what Christian influence has accomplished in the redress of evils in the past, encourages one to hope for similar success in the present. The fact that the economic and social conditions of modern nations may be very different from the ancient is not in itself an obstacle to this, for the nature of man has not changed, and as the supply of his bodily needs is as abundant as ever, so also the application of Christian faith and teaching can still meet the higher needs of the soul and spirit. This

thought emphasizes the need for a higher order of social workers, of men and women who understand their fellows, who work not only with the right motive, but who know the necessities of human nature. Work of this kind on behalf of the Government, which must necessarily be done by hired officials, is often so unsatisfactory.

The wrongs against which the Early Church contended are with us to-day; some are called by new names and some pass under trumpery disguises, but they are still virtually unchanged. *The idea that work is an evil is one of these.* Slavery was the result of the application of this idea. While we may say Christianity has set free the slaves, the false idea which introduced slavery is not yet slain. A correct understanding of the nature of man means among other things a recognition that work—work in the sense of an effort to overcome resistance in order to produce something useful or desirable—so far from being inimical to man's nature is gratifying and satisfying. Every unspoiled child seeks occupation and knows no greater happiness than the joy of making something. A man deprived of the opportunity of working is a crippled man, robbed of the development of his essential powers. A good workman who lost his job a while ago expressed himself: 'For the first fortnight I enjoyed it; after the month I felt I had all the holiday I needed, but now I feel that to be without work is destroying me, body and soul.' The saddest sight of the present day is to witness the degradation of young men in districts where lack of work has been the most persistent, and where hundreds of men in their twenties are to be found who have never earned a wage. Could the dole have been paid as wages, that is, in return for some service rendered, how very different the result would have been.

The Salvation Army is taking part in a small way in the Christlike effort to help some of these men. Three years ago a derelict farmhouse on the side of one of the Welsh hills was acquired and opened as an institute and training centre where unemployed lads, living in their own homes, might profitably spend their days. Under the direction of Salvation Army officers forty-five boys set to work, renovated the house, restored and built fresh out-buildings, and erected new sheds for cobbling and carpentering. Some of the boys were also taught farming and poultry-keeping, the results of which have been most commendable, diplomas and prizes having been won at local shows. A second house has since been obtained, and eighty lads from the surrounding countryside are finding

congenial work for their hands, until regular employment can be found for them.

The Salvation Army has recently begun work in the Penal Colony on the coast of French Guiana. The condition of the men who receive life sentences to this colony is sad in the extreme. The prison itself is merely a series of hutments, each accommodating about fifty prisoners, where they are confined at night without any oversight, and the moral condition of these men is indescribable. The sentences received are prolonged by a similar period spent on the colony after the release from prison; thus a sentence of 'five years' involves a ten years' sojourn in the colony. The lot of those who are 'liberated' is actually far harder than that of the prisoners undergoing hard labour, for the prison administration pays five francs a day for the latter to any one who will employ them. All the work in the little town of Cayenne is done by these criminals, and no work therefore can be found by those, who, having completed their sentences, are 'liberated.' They are left to die of starvation, and that they do so die is proved by the fact that in spite of a quota of seven hundred to a thousand new criminals sent out each year, the number of 'liberated prisoners' does not increase.

There are three classes of criminals in the colony; those sentenced for serious crime, whose sentence is doubled as described; those who, having already suffered seven times a term of imprisonment in France, receive for their eighth offence, however trivial, a life sentence to the penal colony; and political offenders, who are sent to solitary confinement on a small island, known as Devil's Island. It was here that Dreyfus the famous political

offender was incarcerated. At the present time there are less than ten persons on this island, while in French Guiana there are from six to seven thousand criminals.

The Salvation Army received permission to work in the colony in 1933, and has now three institutions there; a hostel where men are fed as cheaply as possible, and hundreds of free meals are given to the poor *libérés* who are unable to obtain work and are starving; and a colony, about twenty-five miles from Cayenne, where we employ about sixty men. The work accomplished for them is amongst the most astonishing record of the grace of God. Many have been truly converted and are now hard-working, honest labourers. There is, too, an institution in St. Laurent, where a penitentiary is situated. The officer there is very isolated, living about one hundred miles from Cayenne, with communication only by boat once a month.

Commissioner Peyron, when in charge of the Army's work in France, endeavoured to promote a Bill in the French Parliament to alter the Law so that the condition of the prisoners can be ameliorated. The first reading was passed unanimously, but in the unsettled state of the Parliament progress along this line is naturally difficult, and the Bill has been allowed to drop.

Pierre Hamp, well known in Paris, has written the preface to the report of this work. He says:

'In going to Guyane the Salvation Army preserves the ideal of the brotherhood of man in a glorious work of mercy whose action, no matter where, is only possible because its impulse is drawn from a world-wide activity, and a knowledge of misery in all its forms.'

---

## The History of the Modern Missionary Movement in India.

A SUGGESTED PARALLEL WITH EARLIER TIMES.

BY THE REVEREND F. W. DILLISTONE, M.A., B.D., ST. ANDREW'S VICARAGE, OXFORD.

'HISTORY,' we are told, 'never repeats itself'—and, strictly speaking, this is a perfectly true dictum. At the same time, history provides examples of movements strangely parallel to one another, and

it is with two such similar developments that this article is concerned.

During the course of its history, Christianity has been introduced into many different environments,



and has naturally met with many different kinds of response. This has depended on various factors—the cultural status of the peoples to whom it has come, their forms of religion, the state of their government, even the geographical features of their country. What we are here suggesting is that in very early days, and again in quite modern times, Christianity has been introduced into two environments which show marked points of similarity. The earlier of the two was the unity which we know as the Roman Empire, the later that unity which we now know as the Empire of India. We shall consider in turn the environments, the coming of Christianity to each, and the response evoked in each case.

I. We may note at least five things about the Græco-Roman world of the first century A.D. Firstly, popular religion had little depth; it consisted mainly in the performance of ancient rites and ceremonies, or in participation in the crude sacraments of some mystery-cult. Secondly, it is clear that philosophy had left behind its great creative period and men were to a great extent simply living on the past. Thirdly, in contrast to this decadence in religion and philosophy, a new and quite remarkable system of law and order had been established, the creation of the organizing genius of imperial Rome. Fourthly, it was a world in which travel had become easy and commerce was flourishing. And so far as the world of commerce was concerned, a very active part was already being taken by an alien race—the Jews. Lastly, it was a world in which there were very definite social barriers, of which the most important was that which separated bond from free.

Turning now to the other environment which we are considering, we shall find several very similar features. The time at which the full impact of Christianity began to be felt in India was at about the beginning of the nineteenth century. To say this is not in the least to belittle earlier missionary efforts by Syrian Christians, Roman Catholics, and Danish Protestants. But the fact remains that those efforts were mainly local or confined to special areas; moreover, they never succeeded in bringing the Christian gospel into the very language and thought of India, and without this there was bound to be a large element of impermanency in their work. But the turn of the century marked the beginning of a new era, and from that time dates the great advance in modern Protestant activity in the country.

What, then, are we to say of the India of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries? So

far as religion was concerned, there had been in the Middle Ages a real period of renaissance associated with such names as Namdev, Tulsi Das, and Caitanya. But the eighteenth century found Hinduism in a terribly backward condition. It consisted almost entirely in the performance of rites and ceremonies often of a quite degrading kind. Festivals were still kept; almost every feature of social custom was marked by some sort of religious rite. But there was little depth and little attempt to connect religion with moral uplift. Then in the realm of philosophy a somewhat similar state of affairs existed. In the Middle Ages there had been the brilliant thinking of Sankara and Ramanuja; now learning had almost ceased and the treasures of the past were practically unknown.

In contrast to this decadence in religion and philosophy, we note that before the end of the eighteenth century a new era was beginning so far as stable government was concerned. For more than four centuries there had been continual fighting and disturbance; but after the Battle of Plassey in 1757 British supremacy gradually asserted itself, and before the close of the century the British Government were taking seriously the great task of governing the peoples of India for their good. This difficult task was complicated by the fact that the powerful East India Company was more bent on commercial gain than on helping the people towards moral or even social uplift. Commerce was flourishing, but the Company had realized that if this was to continue some form of settled government must be attained.

Our last point in the parallel between conditions in the Græco-Roman world and those in India is in the matter of social order. The hard-and-fast distinction between freeman and slave in the former is not unlike the clearly defined barriers which separated caste from caste in the latter. So strong did these barriers appear, that earlier missionaries had even admitted the principle of caste into the organization of the Christian Church. So we may add this similarity in social order to the other parallels already outlined, and we see that the two environments were in many ways extraordinarily alike.

II. Turning to the establishment of Christianity in the first of these environments—the Græco-Roman world—we may note three factors which played a great part in the process. These were (1) the preparatory influence of Jewish synagogues in Greek cities, (2) the great work of one individual, and (3) the existence of the Old Testament in

the Greek language, and the early production of specifically Christian writings also in Greek. The individual of (2) is, of course, the Apostle Paul, who took 'the most signal part in this work of forming non-Jewish communities of believers in Jesus throughout the cities of the Empire' (E. Bevan, *Christianity*, 23). But his work could not have had such depth and permanency had it not been for the real connexion between religion and morality insisted on by the synagogue-teachers, and for the existence of the sacred writings which could confirm and enlighten the converts when Paul was no longer present.

It seems that the gospel spread mainly among the 'slave' classes, though this does not necessarily mean the uneducated classes. A few of higher rank joined the Church, but, for all, this new faith was primarily a way of salvation, and it was only a century or more later that thinkers began seriously to consider the relation between the Christian doctrines and Hellenic thought. The good news of the way of life spread from one to another, a constant stream of men and women passed into the Church, and these were strengthened and confirmed in their faith through common worship and teaching based on the Sacred Scriptures. Such, in brief, was the way in which Christianity came into the environment of the Roman world.

What, now, are we to say of its coming in more modern days to the land of India? We see again the advent of missionaries who belonged to the same race as those in whose hands lay much of the commerce of the country. We see the outstanding influence of one great man, and we see the bringing of the Bible into the vernaculars for the first time. The great man of whom we speak is, perhaps, of all missionaries the one most worthy to be compared with St. Paul—William Carey. The devotion, ability, foresight, and statesmanship of this modern apostle can hardly be over-emphasized. By translating the Bible into language after language, by starting vernacular schools, by founding the famous college at Serampore for the training of Indians to go to their own people, by wise handling of difficult situations with Government authorities—by these and other means, Carey laid the foundations for the Christian Church in India which has grown so rapidly since the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Carey's work was supplemented by that of Alexander Duff, who sought to reach the intelligentsia of India by the way of a Western education imbued with Christian ideals. To this movement initiated by Duff it is hard to suggest a parallel

from earlier times. But the one further parallel we may note in the coming of Christianity to the two environments is in the classes amongst whom it mainly spread. The nineteenth century witnessed the rapid numerical growth of the Church in India through the movement of whole groups from amongst the lower castes into the Christian Church. 'Not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble' came in; but, as in earlier days, those lower in birth and education have yet by their changed lives and by the manifest presence amongst them of the fruit of the Spirit, rebuked and challenged and amazed those of higher status, whose opportunities have been so much greater. Up to the present, Christianity has spread as a way of life, of salvation, of hope; and the importance of teaching and shepherding those who have so eagerly embraced the Christian faith can hardly be exaggerated.

III. Finally, we are to consider what kind of reaction Christianity produced as it came to each of these environments. It is abundantly clear that for a long time in the Roman Empire Christians were an altogether unpopular class. The ordinary people did not like them; the government soon declared the new cult illegal. Probably the people were disturbed in mind by the new insistence, on the strict connexion between religion and morality; they could not abide the abstinence of Christians from the recognized pleasures of society. The Government, on its part, was suspicious of anything which seemed to foster a prior loyalty; this strange regard for an unseen King seemed to undermine the whole splendid fabric of Imperial unity. So there was widespread opposition in many parts of the Empire, and this issued not only in definite persecution, but also in a strong attempt to provide attractive alternatives to the Christian way of life. It is not suggested that the latter was by any means always a conscious process; but the very presence and pressure of a vigorous new faith will act as a stimulant to protagonists of an old faith to set their own house in order.

So, soon after the coming of Christianity into its Græco-Roman environment, there began to be movements towards a revived religious life and a new philosophical system amongst its pagan neighbours. There was, for instance, the sincere attempt of Marcus Aurelius to revive the old pagan-worship in somewhat purer forms. Not until the days of Julian the Apostate was it finally seen how futile such a project was. Further, there was in the second century of the Christian era the extraordinary activity of the Gnostic sects—sects which



combined a syncretistic religious thought with a rigorous asceticism, and would gladly have made terms with Christianity if only Christians would have consented to be included within their system. And, finally, in the realm of philosophy there was the emergence of that most vigorous religious-philosophy, Neo-Platonism, offering men the *summum bonum* of life, the vision of God, quite apart from any dependence on Jewish or Christian teachings. At times, the early Neo-Platonists ignored Christianity, at other times they attacked it; at all times they made it clear that they had a supreme contempt for this unenlightened doctrine, and that with them alone was the true way of life. Christian thinkers had to come to terms with Neo-Platonic ideas, and many to-day would feel that too much of the influence of this religious philosophy was allowed to penetrate into the Christian Church of the succeeding centuries.

Looking back we see that for something like four centuries the conflict went on between Christianity and its environment in the Roman Empire. So far as organized persecution is concerned, this practically came to an end with the issuing of the Edict of Toleration in A.D. 313; the conflict with Gnosticism was drawing to a close by the end of the second century, when the Catholic Church was emerging more sure of itself, more strongly organized, more confident about the content of its faith (here again many to-day would regret the hardening, over-hardening as they would feel, of both faith and organization which came about to no small extent through the conflict with Gnosticism); finally, by the end of the fourth century, there was nothing to fear outwardly from Neo-Platonism as a system, though, as we have suggested, inwardly Christianity imbibed much from the Neo-Platonic thought and outlook.

Turning now to the Indian Empire, what can we discover of the reactions to Christianity during the past hundred and fifty years or so? In the first place, it is interesting to note that not only was it for a long while unpopular amongst the general populace, but also it met with serious opposition from the government. This latter took its rise from the determination of the old East India Company to prevent, if possible, any evangelism amongst Indians. They did not wish the people to be disturbed from their own religious faiths; above all, they did not want to have Christian Indians who would hold, as it were, a point in common with themselves. The result was an attempt to exclude all missionaries from their territories, and although this was overridden by the British Parlia-

ment in 1813, yet this official opposition to the spread of the Christian gospel in India continued really to the time of the Mutiny. The period after the Mutiny may, in a sense, be compared with that following the year 313 in the Roman Empire; only then did full toleration come to Christianity in India. Although there are some who fear that the coming of a larger measure of self-government to India may lead to a renewal of at least a minor persecution of Christians, it is very doubtful whether in these days such an attempt would have any more success than did that of Julian the Apostate in the fourth century A.D.

On the side of religion and philosophy, the last century has witnessed remarkable attempts to purify and revive Hinduism. Undoubtedly, these have owed much to the indirect, if not the direct, influence of Christianity. Of course, in the realm of philosophy, much has been due to the labours of the great Orientalists who have helped to bring to light the treasures of Sanskrit learning and the numerous Sacred Books of India. And, again, the fine encouragement to wider education given by the British Government in India has not failed to have its effect on general progress and enlightenment. At the same time, it is the writer's conviction that the contact with Christian thought and ideals has done most to stimulate the desire for renewal of spiritual and intellectual life amongst the leaders of Hinduism, though many of the sects which have set before themselves this ideal of a revived Hinduism have shown themselves to be anti-Christian in their general outlook.

It is not necessary here to enumerate the various reforming sects such as the Brahmo Samaj and the Arya Samaj which have emerged during the last century; all leading Hindu sects have formed what might be called 'defence associations,' and have sought to eliminate many of the crudities of Hindu worship, while still maintaining that they are orthodox Hindus. More recently, this reforming zeal has even been allowed to touch such an age-long institution as caste. Then, a movement of much less influence, though worth noting because of its parallel with early days, has been the theosophical movement—a kind of Neo-Gnosticism which has practically made India its home. Finally, in the realm of philosophy, there has grown up, since about the year 1870, something which might be called a real Neo-Hinduism. The first college organized by Hindus was opened at Calcutta in 1879; to-day there is a Hindu University in Benares; and the philosophical system of a man like Professor Radhakrishnan is taken with full

seriousness by the thinkers of the West. Behind this new development, it is possible to discern the strong feeling that Hinduism is well able to look after itself; the Neo-Hindus would find it hard to admit how much they owe to the stimulus and challenge of Christian ideals.

To sum up. The present position of Christianity in India seems in many ways comparable to its position in the Roman Empire towards the end of the fourth century A.D. What the immediate future will hold, who can say? But if history teaches us anything, two lessons may well be learned from earlier times to guide future plans. The first is that the thinkers of the Indian Church will do well to weigh the issues very carefully before they make any sort of compromise with the Neo-Hinduism of which we have spoken. The large

body of Neo-Platonic ideas which have found a place in the thought of Western Christendom have proved to be at least of questionable value; and the case may well be the same in the East. The second lesson is one which is fortunately already being taken to heart. The inflow of masses into the Christian Church, as happened after the Edict of Toleration and is happening in no small measure in India to-day, creates vast problems. In earlier days, the Church, not always alive to these problems, showed herself incapable of leading these people out into the full light and freedom of the Christian faith. God grant that the leaders of the Indian Church may have wisdom, courage, and the necessary resources to shepherd and guide the converts of to-day into the whole truth as it is in Christ Jesus!

## In the Study.

### *Virginibus Puerisque.*

What's in a Hand?

BY THE REVEREND R. MARSHALL SMART, M.A.,  
BERWICK-UPON-TWEED.

'And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands.'—Lk 24<sup>40</sup>.

I HAVE a little baby boy in my home who has interested and amused us all with one particular practice of his. . . . Since the day he discovered he had *hands* he has been tremendously interested in them. He will lie in his cot for an hour or more without a whimper, indeed with a smile on his wondering face, LOOKING AT HIS HANDS. Doctor says there is nothing more exquisitely beautiful than a baby's hand. So Baby has a sense of the beautiful. And THEN he can move them this way and that without losing them—they don't fall off or out of the cot, as a teething ring with its bell does! So he gazes wonderingly—curiously at them day after day. And I say, 'He's right in giving them this attention: he's a good judge.' For, quite apart from the story the palmist can read in a hand, the HAND TELLS A TALE. It may speak of long sickness or of tender touch or of art or music or of hard toil. There's the DOCTOR'S HAND which has to be skilful and tender both, and there's the NURSE'S HAND and, in sickness and trouble, MOTHER'S HAND with its soothing touch. There's DADDY'S

HAND stained perhaps with ink or hardened with toil—it works for you.

Isn't it right that we should look at a HAND with wonder and reverence?

In a letter written by a young man dining opposite Sir Walter Scott's house, we read:

'I dined one day with a party, gay and thoughtless, enjoying the first flush of manhood, with little remembrance of the yesterday or care of the morrow. After an hour or so I observed a shadow come over the aspect of my friend and feared he was unwell. "No," said he, "I shall be well if you will let me sit where you are; but there is a hand at the window in sight of me here which won't let me lift my glass. It fascinates my eye. It never stops; page after page is finished and thrown down on that heap of MS.; and still it goes on unwearied, and so it will be until candles are brought in, and God knows how long after that. It is the same every night." "Some stupid, dogged, engrossing clerk, perhaps," said I.

"No, boys," said our host, "I know whose hand it is . . . it is Walter Scott's!"'

IT WAS SIR WALTER SCOTT'S HAND WRITING . . . WRITING . . . WRITING his wonderful Waverley novels to clear off thousands of pounds of debt!

I think one of the most touching things told about our late beloved King George as he lay dying was his repeated and pathetic attempts to sign the document that gave his Queen and his sons sovereign



powers. You could almost see the struggles of the royal hand that held the pen in the description given of that closing scene in our monarch's life by the Archbishop of Canterbury. A KING'S HAND dutiful to the last !

THEN THERE'S THE HAND OF THE KING OF KINGS. He was known by His hands after the Resurrection. . . . PIERCED HANDS. . . . 'He showed them his hands.' LOVE DIVINE endured the nails driven into the hands, for your sake and mine. This HAND, like that of the breadwinner, bears marks of love and pain and service. LOOK AT IT WONDERINGLY, CURIOSLY, AND LOVINGLY. All this He did for me and for you.

You will not be ashamed of the hand, once sweet and beautiful like Baby's, that is now . . . hard . . . stained . . . bruised maybe . . . with work or service . . . the hand of your father or mother, and you will NEVER, NEVER be ashamed of the pierced hand of Christ.

WHAT'S IN A HAND ? 'Behold his hands' . . . with the marks of loving service plain to see. . . . Use your hands, little as they are, now, for deeds of kindness, and in the days that are to come may they always tell a tale of sacrifice or of service !

Lord Jesus,  
Take my hands, and let them move  
At the impulse of Thy love  
NOW AND ALWAYS. Amen.

#### An Easter Message.

BY THE REVEREND J. IRELAND HASLER,  
ORPINGTON, KENT.

'Our Saviour Christ Jesus, who abolished death, and brought life and incorruption to light.'—2 Ti 1<sup>10</sup> (R.V.).

That's a strange statement to make about death. How can it be true ? Why, Jesus Himself died, and later on Paul who wrote these words died also, and, from that day till now, all over the world people have died. Outside London there's a very, very big cemetery with hundreds of graves, and it is called the 'Necropolis,' which means 'City of the Dead.' And there are those of you who can remember some one whom you knew and loved who was with you a year ago but who has since passed away. What could Paul have meant when he said that Jesus abolished death ?

You are not the first to ask that question. Once, away in India, in the main street of the city of Delhi, an Indian preacher was speaking to a little crowd of people about the difference which Jesus Christ has made. Suddenly one of his hearers interrupted him and said : 'You say that Jesus

Christ has abolished death, but you Christians die just as we Hindus and Muhammadans do. How can you expect us to believe that ?' The preacher replied : 'My friend, you know that if you go on down to the end of this street you'll come to the Fort, and perhaps you have been inside to see the marble buildings. If so, you know the nature of the entrance. First you pass through the outer gateway into a long passage, all roofed over so that it is rather dark, and then at the end of it is another gateway which leads you right into the Fort itself. There are British soldiers living in the Fort now, but in former days the King of Delhi used to live there in the beautiful palace. And in the Fort, too, are dungeons where prisoners used to be shut up. Sometimes a prisoner would be brought out of his dungeon and led through that long arcade. But he knew that when he came out again into the light it would be to his place of execution, and so his passing through those gateways was full of fear and sadness and despair. At other times, however, the King's own son would have to visit the city. He would have to pass through the same gloomy passage as the former man, yet how different would be his experience. He would be full of excitement and the hope of pleasure. There would be crowds outside ready to welcome him with shouts of joy, and there would be new sights and scenes such as he could not see in the palace. Prince and prisoner both had to leave the Fort by the same way, yet to one that way was a way of delight, and to the other, of dread. So all men have to leave this world by the same dark gateway, but Jesus Christ has taken away the dread and uncertainty connected with it. Those who really love and serve Him know that they pass, not into a denser darkness, but into a brighter light and a fuller and happier life.'

So we sing on Easter Sunday :

Jesus lives ! henceforth is death  
But the gate of life immortal ;  
This shall calm our trembling breath  
When we pass its gloomy portal.

*Hallelujah !*

#### The Christian Year.

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

Sweeping and Furnishing.

'The unclean spirit . . . saith, I will return unto my house whence I came out.'—Lk 11<sup>24</sup>.

The homing instinct is natural and praiseworthy. Given the existence of unclean spirits—and of

their effectiveness, if not of their actual being, there are unhappily too many signs—it would be natural for them to go, or return wherever they feel that they are entitled to expect a welcome. The situation here envisaged is a very common one. A character has won a partial victory. But there is a weak point somewhere. Somehow the defence is not adequate.

The ordinary interpretation of the passage lays stress on the word 'empty.' It is because no trouble has been taken to fill up the empty space with positive, constructive goodness. This is in itself profoundly true. No less than Nature, grace abhors a vacuum. But the word 'empty' occurs only in St. Matthew's version, not in St. Luke's. It is probably not part of the original. It is in St. Matthew's version what is called a 'gloss,' a comment which some copyist could not refrain from putting in because he thought it must have fallen out, or perhaps even unconsciously, without knowing that he was adding anything. Such additions give an illuminating glimpse into the psychology of copyists, and very often, as here, they are a sign of the intrinsic reasonableness of the addition itself.

But, if our Lord only said 'swept and garnished,' does it not make the warning much more subtle and much more profound? Any one can see that an empty character is dangerous. It takes consummate insight to be the first to perceive that a 'swept and garnished' character may nevertheless be, in the common phrase, asking for trouble.

What is meant by 'swept and garnished'? It must mean a character over which pains have been taken. But that, it may be said, is surely right. Is it not most important to cultivate the virtues—justice, prudence, temperance, and fortitude—to build up moral capital?

The answer may seem strange, but it is not an unqualified affirmative. The abstract way of righteousness is practised with success by the few already strong characters. But most of us are not choice and master spirits. A good many of us, in younger and less humble days, and even now in twisted and unrecollected hours, have tried that way, and have come to a dead end. The real way is that indicated by one of St. Paul's metaphors. After speaking of the works of the flesh, he goes on to speak, not of the works, but of the fruits of the spirit. Goodness, it seems, is a thing which grows. We do not create it, any more than we create our bodily health. If a soul is converted—that is to say, if it belongs to Christ and is united with Christ—then goodness will presently manifest itself.

In the first century, and again in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there were some who laid hold of this Pauline doctrine of justification by faith with a crooked and one-sided grasp. They were called Solifidians. They said, 'We have faith. We are enlightened. And so' (this was the fatal inference) 'it does not matter what we do. We are beyond good and evil.' There is in Scott's *Woodstock* a picture of an ignorant soldier who had persuaded himself of the truth of this soul-destroying creed. But, generally speaking, the people who have set most store by this Pauline doctrine of justification by faith have been most scrupulous in their conduct.

Against actually taking pains with ourselves there is nothing to say. Only there are two ways of doing it. One way produces Pharisaism, the other humble faith.

'Swept.' In India the principle of the division of labour is carried to great lengths. There are 'sweepers,' who sweep and do nothing else, just as there are water-carriers and punkah-coolies, and so on. We can imagine that a simple-minded Indian sweeper might suppose that the well-being of the whole household depended upon him. He sees the world in terms of his own calling. So might a domestic animal, the cat, think of the family as those who live in her house.

Sweeping to earn a living is an honourable trade. Sweeping our character is a desirable and necessary practice. But it is a mistake to define all life, all duty, in terms of brush and broom. And any who may think that by performing duties they have established a credit balance at the eternal exchange, which God cannot choose but honour, have misunderstood the nature of the Christian religion, have confounded law with grace.

'Garnished,' adorned, furnished. It would seem that the unclean spirit in the Parable, returning to his former home, found there a character not only swept amiss, but also furnished wrongly. What can have been the matter? Was it that the owner—or shall we say the tenant?—of that life had ill-chosen furniture? It is not difficult to cumber up the space with unprofitable and even evil things. But there is no hint of that—at first. Was it ill-arranged? Had he still in what should have been the serious study of his house the toys and child's books of his youth, not yet outgrown? Did he hang his clothes or keep his stores of food and drink in the place which should have been an oratory or place of prayer? It may be so, but there is no hint of it—at first. Was it that he allowed the furniture to be an end in itself? The truth is that all fittings are good, or bad, in some



kind of relation to life. Furnishing; or the lack of it, is nothing, or very little, in itself. What matters is the kind of life which is served by it. Sweeping and furnishing are steps in the preparation of material for life. They are not life itself. Let us suppose that a man has acute intelligence, a marvellous memory, a vivid historical imagination, an attractive manner. That these things are good material it would be foolish to deny. But is it not possible for such a man to think of himself, as St. Paul says, so temperately, yet so condemningly, 'more highly than he ought to think'? In the Parable the actual meaning was that from the Jewish nation there had been cast out the one demon of idolatry. That had gone from their national life. But somehow the sweeping and garnishing that followed had come to be thought of as ends in themselves. And so the old demon came back—shall we say in the form of the worship of the Letter?—and with it came the seven other demons of covetousness, hypocrisy, spiritual pride, uncharitableness, faithlessness, formalism, and fanaticism.

These may seem idle fears. But there are many kinds of idolatry, and one or two demons may do as much harm as seven. Imagine, for example, a victory—a real, undoubted victory—gained over some sin of the body. In spite of that, perhaps even because of it, pride and intolerance contrive to win a lodging in the refined and polished character.

But we do not end with a prospect so discouraging. All of us like to avoid discouragement, and Christians always can. The Gospel ends with the sentimental person who said, 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee.' She envied the Mother who had been brought into an intimate and personal relation with the speaker of the beautiful and gracious words. But there is something about Christianity essentially democratic, vernacular, and popular. 'Yea, rather, blessed,' the Lord says, 'are those who have not the rare gift that few, or only one, can have, but those who have the gift that any one can have. Blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.'<sup>1</sup>

#### FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

##### The Law of Liberty.

'We are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free.'—Gal 4<sup>31</sup>.

Here we are concerned with the thought of two things—liberty and captivity. We are to bring

every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. When He gives us His command, Go and prepare My way before Me, if we are true disciples we must obey. When He lays down the law of the spiritual life that none can reach His right hand and His left except through suffering and crucifixion, it is a law which must be obeyed. But on the other hand we read such words as those of the text: 'We are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free'; or 'the glorious freedom of the children of God'; or 'where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom'; or 'stand therefore in the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free.' How can we speak of captivity and obedience in the same breath with freedom or liberty? St. James twice over is bold enough to speak of 'the law of freedom'; and St. Peter says that Christians are to be 'as free,' and yet 'as slaves of God.' The words seem, at first sight, to present to us a contradiction in terms. When a man is freed from chains, or locked doors, or slavery, or restrictions, he can do as he likes and go where he pleases. And the word 'law' might seem to give us yet another restriction. Thou shalt do this, and Thou shalt not do that, hardly appear to leave a man free. If he is obliged to obey, that is, if he is punished when he disobeys, where is his freedom? But does a parent enslave his children when he teaches them to obey him? Does he give them freedom when he spoils them, and allows them to disobey him? St. James quite clearly says No. His expression, 'the law of freedom,' gives us a new and higher idea of what freedom means.

It has this meaning in the natural as well as in the spiritual world. There are what we call the laws of health; and, if our body is to be free from illness, we must obey them. The laws are absolute, for they are laws of God's own making. Which, then, is best—to be free to do as we like with our bodies, or to be free from illness? The one is the wrong, and the other the right meaning of freedom.

Not many years ago the aeroplane, the submarine, the telegraph, and many other inventions, were undreamt of. All these involve certain natural laws—the law of gravitation, the laws which 'govern,' as we say, the strength of metals, electricity, chemistry, and a hundred other things. And these laws were all existent in the world then as now; and then as now they were absolute, inexorable. But men had not learnt to understand them, and therefore could not obey them. And because they could not obey them, they were not free. They were unable to send a message to the other side of the planet in less than the twinkling

<sup>1</sup> S. C. Carpenter, *The House of Pilgrimage*, 158.

of an eye; they were unable to travel and take photographs at the bottom of the sea; they were unable to fly through the air at a hundred miles an hour. They were unable to do countless things that they can do now, and therefore they were not as free as they are now.

If a man goes up in an aeroplane and disobeys some law involved in flying, would he be prepared to justify himself by saying that he is a free man and can do what he likes? We know that the result of his disobedience will be catastrophe, immediate and very likely fatal.

We cannot turn to a single department of thought or life without finding the same principle unalterably at work. And we need not expect to find any difference when we think about the spiritual life of our souls. Some of us may have had moments when we were swept with a longing desire to grow in holiness. We have read of some of the great saints, modern as well as ancient; and we feel that we are not in the least like them. We are so ordinary, so weak, so easily tired of goodness and of God. And all because we have not learnt to *obey*. The man who knows and obeys the relevant laws can mount his aeroplane and fly freely. We know the laws of the spiritual life, and we don't obey them, and therefore we remain earthbound and helpless.

We know the law, for instance, that he that loseth his life—his Self—shall find it. Obedience to that law means a steady, continuous, consistent sacrifice of Self. But if, instead of that, we live our life on the do-as-I-like method, the result is not freedom but catastrophe; 'he that saveth his life shall lose it.'

We know the law that spiritual progress is impossible without prayer, as the progress of a steam engine is impossible without steam. But instead of storing our life with a full, driving, irresistible supply of this source of energy, some of us try to get along with a minimum of it. Let us remind ourselves again that God is one in whom is no variableness neither shadow of turning. He has given our spiritual life a law which shall not be broken, the law of the absolute necessity of real prayer. And nothing in heaven or earth will induce Him to alter it. If we obeyed it our progress would be free.

Once more. We know the law—or the truism, or the self-evident proposition—that if a Divine gift is to be of use to us we must use it. The supremest of Christ's 'gifts unto men' is His gift of Himself by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. We possess the possibility of the whole, full, bound-

less energy of God. And we don't use it. We *can* use it; it can be as a burning, blazing furnace within us, producing the steam power which can drive us forward. And we *can* change the hearts, and comfort the sorrows, and strengthen the wills, and lighten the darkness of the men and women round us; we can draw them with the cords of a man, the cords of love, to yield themselves to Christ's captivity and follow in His train; or we could, if we obeyed the Divine law. Our love would be free, and therefore our spiritual work and progress would be free, if we obeyed the perfect law, the law of freedom.<sup>1</sup>

#### PASSION SUNDAY.

##### Uncounted Sacrifice.

'There came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard very precious; and she brake the box, and poured it on his head.'—Mk 14<sup>3</sup>.

This episode in the last week of Jesus' life forms a passing gleam of brightness, just before the sun went down in a brief night. The effect is heightened by contrast with incidents before and after. The first two verses of this chapter reveal the priests and politicians plotting how to get their hands upon Christ, and silence Him for ever: the verses next following let us see Judas driving his bargain, fixing the price. Between the two comes our story. It stands out framed between malice and treachery. Like some shining object, set in the foreground of a gloomy canvas, it draws and holds the eye, and from its surroundings we turn to it for relief.

According to St. John, the woman concerned in this episode was Mary, Martha's sister.

Let us think first of the *greatness of Mary's sacrifice*. When in these last days she woke up to realize that Christ's references to His approaching death were seriously meant, it is likely that her first impulse was to ask, was there anything she could do? Her intuition told her what was coming—not only the fact of Calvary, but something of its meaning. She did not try to give Him advice; she did not say, like Peter, 'Be it far from thee, Lord; this shall not be.' Instead, she thought of something that would manifest her reverent gratitude. She came in quietly with this present fit for a king, broke the neck of the vessel lest it should ever be used again and also lest the bystanders might have time to interrupt her, poured the perfume out upon His head, and from it rose

<sup>1</sup> A. H. McNeile, *He Led Captivity Captive*, 100.



up a sweet odour that filled the room, and even yet fills the Church of God.

The gift cost much in money, but far more in spiritual effort; and it is that inexpressible inward strain, clothing itself in outward sacrifice, that imparts to her action some of its most beautiful qualities. One of these qualities Jesus Himself brings out—its *timeliness*. 'She hath anointed my body beforehand for the burying.' There is something inept in the suggestion that by this statement is meant only that by chance she had happened to select that precise moment in the week of Calvary. No: she had thought and thought again concerning His destiny, because faith and love made Him the inevitable subject of her pondering, and thus she had worked her way into the secret that Christ was going to die in fidelity to God and for love of men. It is not the logical faculty or business-like acumen that guides us right; all depends on whether or not we care for Him and the things for which He stands, and whether, as we look to the Cross, it is with eyes quickened by faith and love.

Another quality of her act is its *unconventionality*. Her methods obviously were very far from commending themselves to the disciples, who never dreamt that half the value of the act—so at least Jesus felt—lay in its being so spontaneous, so untaught, that manifestly it came from the heart. The bystanders thought it most peculiar conduct, opposed to all rules, quite absurdly generous and quixotic. Is not this the very objection levelled at Jesus every day of His life? He broke the rules. He refused to be the kind of Messiah demanded by the Jews, and even thus far by His followers, and, instead of shattering the nations with a rod of iron, He gave Himself away by sympathy, by kindness, by sacrifice.

Christians are in need of this lesson. In religion tradition has terrible power for evil, and perhaps in all life there is nothing more difficult to abolish than a religious practice or opinion which once upon a time marked a real advance, but is antiquated now. No one argues that what was good enough for our grandparents in locomotion or public health is still good enough for us; but is the conviction equally widespread throughout the Church that a parallel steady progress is not only natural but indispensable in affairs of conduct or religious methods?

John Wesley tells us of the struggle it cost him to begin preaching out of doors—'I thought souls could not be saved,' he writes, 'unless it were done in a church'—but his great heart drove him out

into the fields, where he worked a miracle for England.

Christian religion is perpetually in need of more heart; and that precondition, if history can prove anything, has far more to do than clever brains with spiritual inventiveness or philanthropic originality.

There is next the *moral beauty* of what Mary did. In our version Christ calls it 'a good work'; but what He really said was, 'She has done a beautiful thing to me.' Now this view was roundly challenged by the onlookers, with Judas at their head; and we ought not to close our eyes to the fact that it is challenged to this hour, and on substantially the same grounds. The disciples took what may be called the view of common sense. The thing is impractical, they said; it is wickedly extravagant.

Now any of us, in our worse moments, might have sided with them, or at least felt they had an extremely strong case. It is always easier by all odds to state grounds for the shrewd, hard-headed opinion of the man in the street than for the loving intuitions of faith in the Unseen. And yet the man in the street, so far as he is merely shrewd, is wrong. What proves him wrong is this, that in certain spheres of life, if there be a spark of nobleness left in him, he brings in other and loftier principles which laugh utility out of court. No man conducts home life on business methods. No man treats his own sick child on commercial lines. Love breaks in, and workaday business flies out of the window. Christianity tells us, what in our hearts we know, that there are certain things—truth, purity, the world-wide cause of righteous liberty, fellowship with God—the worth of which has no relationship of any kind to mere usefulness in the lower sense. It is their intrinsic worth that matters.

Let us now turn to *Jesus' defence of Mary*. He has been defending women all these centuries, sometimes against themselves, sometimes against men who take rank as His followers. And He defended a woman now. It is as though He spread His hands protectingly above her head. As if to say: None of you, maybe, would have done such a thing, but do not make your insight, your imagination, your love a standard for the world. Refuse to hamper the pioneers. Let the great-hearted have their opportunity.

Then He continued: 'She hath done what she could,' by which we mean: 'It was a small thing, but at least she did it, and could you ask for more?' But as a writer of insight points out, that is not what Jesus meant at all. 'It is precisely the re-

verse. The disciples did not reproach the woman for doing so little, but for doing so much; and Jesus justified her, not by reducing her act to smaller proportions, but by revealing it in all its depth and height, and showing that it was greater than she herself knew.' But in fact, as we read the story, we perceive that Christ's defence had begun long before He opened His lips. It began when silently He accepted Mary's gift. He knew that for Him, and for all that He represented as well as all He was about to do, no offering could be too great.

Jesus' defence concludes with a prophecy, unparalleled in Scripture, predicting for Mary's act a future of undying fame, and to-day, as we look on together at this scene, we are helping to fulfil it. 'Whosoever this gospel shall be preached . . . this also that she hath done shall be spoken of.' But everything that has to do with Christ has the two aspects of judgment and of promise. These two are here. What Mary did, judged and condemned the bystanders, and also it may condemn us. It may remind us that a Christianity that has become nothing more than sensible, prudent, or self-regarding is not what Christ seeks and can win no one for His cause. Religion is only convincing, it is only infectious, when it does things over which the selfish shake their heads.

But promise is here as well. It is a good omen if we have felt the impulse, and at least sometimes have yielded to it, to do things for Christ and man that left all calculation far behind. The capacity for it is in us all. A few years ago, men in thousands whom we called pleasure-loving gave all they had for country and freedom. There is in Jesus a mightier power still to inspire this readiness 'to spend and be spent to the utmost for a cause greater than life itself.'<sup>1</sup>

#### PALM SUNDAY.

##### How far away to Galilee?

'He started from Galilee, and now he is here.'—Lk 23<sup>6</sup> (Moffatt).

'Jesus started from Galilee preaching the gospel of God,' and now He is nearing the gate of Jerusalem. We must believe that the Cross was already casting its shadow over those happy days in Galilee, and that Jesus knew how this journey, begun in Galilee, was going to end. The preaching of the last generation was largely engaged with what came to be known as 'the Galilean Gospel,'

<sup>1</sup> H. R. Mackintosh, *The Highway of God*, 123.

with its idyllic convention of simple fishermen and flower-bedecked meadows, through which Jesus walked with His disciples, or by the blue waters of the lake. The Cross had largely dropped out of the picture, and it was of the great *human* Friend and Teacher that we heard, with His unclouded trust in God and His new message of forgiveness and love, which the common people were so glad to hear.

We tried to make our services happy and attractive by dwelling on the tender and comforting aspects of the life and ministry of Jesus, but there was no joy in our worship. Without the Cross there can be no reality or joy. Without the dark background, the Galilean Gospel has no meaning; without the dark, threatening forces of evil that were massing up against Jesus and in the end broke like a flood, carrying all before it, sweeping aside even the Roman authority itself and its boasted sense of justice.

And when I read the thrilling lore  
Of Him who walked upon the sea,  
I long, oh! how I long once more  
To follow Him in Galilee.

Not that picture of Jesus, but the picture given of Him in another hymn, brings us to a sense of our sin, to a sense of God:

When I survey the wondrous cross  
On which the Prince of glory died,  
My richest gain I count but loss,  
And pour contempt on all my pride.

The Galilean Gospel was too colourless to convert, or to give a sense of the great reality which went with Jesus from the beginning in everything He said or did. Even the demons knew who He was and what He was about. 'What have we to do with Thee?' or, as Moffatt turns it, 'What business have you with us, Jesus of Nazareth?' Yes, He meant business when He started out from Galilee, preaching the gospel of God.

In face of all opposition Jesus went on. When they told Him that the daughter of Jairus was dead, and that He need not trouble Himself to come farther, we read that Jesus went on. An angry crowd once tried to stop Him for good, but we are told that He passed through their midst. He was possessed of the Spirit, the Spirit that was afterwards released at Pentecost, sweeping all before Him. And as He came within sight of the end and set His face steadfastly towards Jerusalem, the sense of impulsion and urgency became all the stronger. Think of that scene which Mark gives us



so dramatically: Jesus walking on in front with great strides and the disciples following behind, in a huddled, breathless sort of way, not able to keep up with Him. 'He had a baptism to be baptized with, and how he was straitened till it should be accomplished.'

It is of that last pilgrimage that we are being reminded to-day, the last journey into Jerusalem. Before ever He set out from Galilee He knew where He was going. Dr. John Hutton reminds us that 'we, too, must know where we are going before we set out, unless we are, as we say, out merely for a walk!' Only the other day I asked my little girl to come out with me, and she asked where I was going. I said, 'Nowhere in particular, just for a walk'; at which her face fell and she said, 'I like always to have somewhere particular to go.' Jesus had a definite objective; although there were those even of His own disciples who thought that He had none, that He was an idealist, without any plan of campaign or goal of endeavour. If we trace the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, we shall realize something of the urge, the Divine determination and purpose that drove Him on and on. We see the various places through which He had to go, as, for instance, Samaria. It was on the direct route between Galilee and Jerusalem, although no Jew ever went that way if he could help it. Yet 'Jesus must needs go through Samaria.' He had work to do there that had far-reaching effects. Punctually He was there. We are told the actual hour. 'It was about the sixth hour,' that is, about noon.

Professor Gossip tells of his induction to a charge in Forfar and of a speech on that occasion by Dr. Alexander Whyte, whose assistant he had once been. He told them how God had from all eternity been thinking of them and anticipating all their needs and requirements, making plans and provision for them and preparing for them just the right kind of minister who would meet their need; and then, sinking his voice almost to a whisper, for he himself was greatly moved, and pointing in the direction of the new minister, he said, 'And now, at long last, *punctually* he is here!' It is the idea of the text. 'He started from Galilee and now, punctually, he is here.' His hour had struck.<sup>1</sup>

The triumphant entry into Jerusalem startles us by its apparent incongruity with the way of Jesus. It was a principle with Him to avoid the spectacular, and He kept a watchful eye on any rising tide of mass emotion. But His entry into Jerusalem was spectacular—and it was intended to be so.

The prophecy of Zechariah which St. Matthew recalls in this connection cannot have been absent from the mind of Jesus, and it is worth while to continue it beyond the point at which the Evangelist stopped. 'Behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass. And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off: and he shall speak peace unto the nations; and his dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth.'

When Jesus rode into the city, He knew that every habitable part of the earth had its representatives among the myriads gathered at Jerusalem that day, and all Jerusalem heard a message and were confronted with His claim before the night had come. The action of Jesus is consistent neither with humility nor good sense unless His mind had firm hold of a purpose which reached far back into the history of His people, and forward to a boundless reign of peace and blessedness. Nothing can save the Triumphal Entry from an intolerable theatricality if it was not the symbol of something at least as wonderful and transforming as the Christian faith has declared Him to be. History has its comment to make. Now, after nineteen centuries, when He still has no kingdom worthy of Him, and His people are so little like Him that the best of them are almost ashamed to claim His name, He yet has such a kingdom and such a people as no one could have dreamed of then.<sup>2</sup>

He started from Galilee and now He is here. He has gone the whole round. That is what so many object to in Jesus. It was Emerson's objection: that He made such tremendous claims; that 'He was not satisfied with a segment of life but a complete whole.' If He would only keep to one little corner of life. If He would only restrict Himself to Galilee, it would be all right. If only He would not insist on meeting face to face the naked and brutal facts of sin and unreality and uncover the whole miserable business of hypocrisy, overturning the money counters in the Temple itself, challenging conventional religion and everything that supports it! If only He would not go to such unreasonable lengths more people would follow Him. He always makes it difficult for any to follow Him, any except those who have no reserves in their obedience. He goes the whole way, the whole round, and all who follow Him must do the same. 'Behold, we go up to Jerusalem,' He is saying to us now, as, long ago, to His disciples.

<sup>1</sup> E. Macmillan, *Seeking and Finding*, 59.

<sup>2</sup> W. R. Maltby, *Christ and His Cross*, 54.

In the life of Christian discipleship the goal is given at the beginning. 'He started from Galilee, and now he is here.' No longer is He preaching the gospel of God. He has delivered His message, and He is now about to seal His testimony. The time for speech is gone; the time for action is come. It is time for the last great Action, as the Atonement used to be called. 'Now he is here,' punctually; not a moment too soon, not a moment too late.

And beyond the Cross and the grave He will still keep His appointments, punctually. 'Behold, he goeth before you into Galilee, as he said unto you,' was the word of the angel to the affrighted women on the Resurrection morning. For, as He had started in Galilee so He would end there His earthly ministry. 'Now he is here.' We can start with Him here and now. It is the only place and time of which we may be sure, absolutely sure. Here and now we may begin the journey with Him.

#### EASTER DAY.

##### Mistaken Suppositions.

'Supposing him to be the gardener.'—Jn 20<sup>15</sup>.

'They . . . supposed that they had seen a spirit.'—Lk 24<sup>37</sup>.

When Mary Magdalene stood in Joseph's garden on the morning of the Resurrection she mistook the Risen Saviour for the Arimathean's gardener. The mistake is easily explained. The light was still dim. And had the light been better—well, there were tears in the woman's eyes. Yes, and the mistake admits of a somewhat deeper explanation than this.

We see most easily what we are looking for. Expectation is almost part of the power of vision. Mary wanted some one to tell her what had become of the body of Jesus. And when a figure loomed in the uncertain light, she came to the simple and likely conclusion that it was Joseph's gardener. Then the figure spoke her name, and in a moment she knew—first of all human souls to know it—that Christ was risen from the dead, and that the hope of the world was splendid, eternal truth.

Now look at another scene. It was the evening of that same day. The darkness had fallen. The disciples were gathered in a house in some narrow street of old Jerusalem. The door was barred, for the temper of the Jews was uncertain, and there were not wanting tokens that boded no good to the disciples of the Nazarenè, and suddenly One stood among them whom they had all known and whom they still loved. But in a flash they thought of that final tragedy on Calvary. Death was final, and He

had died. They thought, too, of the door so certainly and securely locked, of the windows so firmly barred. And terror seized their spirits. They supposed that they saw a ghost—something unreal, unearthly, a thing of mystery and dread, till the voice that had revealed the simple truth to Mary Magdalene in the dawn spoke to them: 'Why are ye troubled?' and their hearts caught the glorious truth that Christ was risen.

Putting these two incidents side by side, we can see a picture of the twofold difficulty of that new life that Christ came to reveal. We can see, as in a parable, the two ways in which we fail to gather and use the great revelation that Jesus makes to us. We make the mistake that Mary Magdalene made. We love an easy, earthly explanation of life. We pass unmoved, unenlightened through some hour that might have been a great hour of the soul, because, for us, life is pre-judged. The sanity, the likeliness of Mary's conclusions were beyond criticism. But she was wrong. And her mistake teaches us that the truth as it is in Jesus may give the lie to all time-born probabilities. The empty sepulchre is not an isolated marvel. It is not just a splendid, lonely mystery, challenging for evermore the mind that must still live on in a world wholly governed by laws that are traceable; and wholly made up of situations that admit of being reasoned out. That empty sepulchre has filled the round world with mystery. It has enlarged beyond the range of our reason the possibilities of human life. It has made faith and love and worship and spiritual obedience chief factors in each day's reckonings.

Now we know that the simplest facts of life, its toils and its leisure, its wayside greetings, its laughter and its tears, are beyond our earthly understanding. We can so easily misinterpret them, so habitually mishandle them. They ask of us a faith that shall reveal the wondrous presence and sovereign will of Christ our Saviour. In the earthliness of our minds we suppose so many shallow and foolish things. We suppose it was an accident; we suppose it was a failure; we suppose it made no difference; we suppose it was just a business transaction, a greeting, a disappointment; we suppose it was just the gift of a friend, sympathy of a neighbour, the music of a song, the word of a book; we suppose it was just a thought the sunset brought us, a sickness from which we recovered—thanks to the doctor—the sweet prattle of a little child. Thus we move in the dim light of the garden and see only the gardener. Thus we ask our questions, follow our plans, do our work, and bear our sorrow,



unconscious of that Divine Saviour whose presence and power and love fill all things.

The mistake that the disciples made in the evening was just the opposite of the mistake that Mary Magdalene had made in the dawn. She accepted too easily the verdict of sense and judgment, whilst they in their explanation of the figure that appeared among them went beyond the range of all that had ever been real and intelligible.

Can we find in that stupefied and fear-stricken company a lesson we need to learn? Is it not the reality of the unseen world, the real existence, the immediate and practical significance of the things of the spirit? We lock the door, we bar the windows of the house of life. We shelter ourselves amid the securities and fellowships of earth. But in spite of every bolt and bar He comes. Conscience beholds a vision of judgment. The sinful soul has vision of the hands its sins have pierced. The human heart in its weariness and longing beholds the outstretched arms of Divine pity. But all the earthliness within us rises to cast doubt on the reality and worth of that vision. We treat the deepest thoughts that come to us as mere ghosts of the mind; the most vital and momentous moods as mere tricks of feeling. Our fear of the tremendous spiritual realities is not always manifest. It is often well concealed. But beneath many a specious argument, many a robust determination, many a plunge into what men call practical things, there lurks, as the hidden motive, the fear of coming face to face with the true eternal world of the spirit.

It was the same figure that Mary mistook for the gardener, and that the disciples mistook for an apparition. It was the same living, loving Saviour of human souls. In Jesus the two worlds meet. That new life that we are called to live through faith in Him can make the familiar things of life flash out with wondrous beauty and meaning, and can make the deep and awesome solemnities of the spiritual world brighten with gracious hopes and comforting promises.

Just one other thought. To Mary Magdalene

who had mistaken Him for the gardener, Jesus said, 'Touch me not.'<sup>1</sup> To the disciples who had mistaken Him for a ghostly visitant, an unreality, Jesus said, 'Handle me and see—for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye behold me having.'

On Mary Magdalene Jesus laid a new law of reverence, on the disciples a new law of familiarity. And does not the Risen Christ this day lay those laws upon us? Sometimes we handle life with too much familiarity. We hold our tasks, our opportunities, our privileges, and our hopes with an almost irreverent assurance. So indifferently the privileges of life come to be handled. We can even tread the path of prayer without awe, and certainly we often face the work and fellowship of life as things of small account. Mary thought that things were just as they had been before. She did not realize the tremendous spiritual meaning of the Resurrection. She did not realize that now Christ's bodily presence was but a sacrament of His abiding spiritual presence in all believing hearts. She would have been content to have kissed the Master's feet. But that was to be too easily satisfied. She had to apprehend Him and to love Him in a higher and a holier way. So would Jesus give us each to pass through life with a new diffidence, a new reverence, a new and holy vision of all familiar things.

And sometimes we do not get near enough to life. We dare not come to close grips with the splendid hopes and visions God in His mercy sends to our struggling souls. They are vague, remote, un comforting. When it is so with us, there come those other words, spoken to the trembling, vision-haunted disciples, 'Handle me and see.' Put each great thought, each dazzling hope, each wondrous vision to the test here in the maze and sorrow of the years, here in the press of human things. And that same fellowship with Christ that has made each passing duty a thing of immortal worth shall make the eternal truth of God a thing of immediate comfort.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> P. C. Ainsworth, *The Pilgrim Church*, 87.

## Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTHSHIRE.

THE Lachish inscribed potsherds, discovered under the burnt debris of the guardroom floor, and thus dating from the fall of the city, have been translated and studied by Professor Torczyner, who is publishing his comments on them. As Lachish was one of the defenced cities that remained unfallen until the closing period of Zedekiah's reign (Jer 34<sup>7</sup>), *c.* 587 B.C., when Nebuchadrezzar besieged Jerusalem, it is to the last year or two of this period that the letters must be dated. This seems to be corroborated by the mention of Nedabiah, a grandson of king Jehoiakim (1 Ch 3<sup>16-18</sup>) as the bearer of one of the letters, for he could not have been old enough until this time—as it was, he could not be more than eleven or twelve by the end of Zedekiah's reign—to be entrusted with such an important mission. One of the letters (No. 4), indeed, implies that it was sent to Lachish at the very time when this city and Azekah were practically isolated owing to the invasion, and were in communication by means of fire-signals with some friendly outpost. This was the time when the pro-Egyptian party in Jerusalem were looking anxiously for the arrival of Hophra's army from Egypt to relieve the situation, and the letters seem to give hints of the military contact that was being maintained between the two countries. A great desire for peace is expressed in the letters. But we must wait for Professor Torczyner's translation of them, and his views as to the circumstances under which they were written, before forming definite conclusions. It is interesting to note in one of the letters (No. 2) how the correspondent compares himself to a dog in the presence of his lord, using expressions which are practically identical with those in the Old Testament (2 K 8<sup>13</sup>, 1 S 17<sup>43</sup>, 2 S 9<sup>8</sup>), and reminding us of the fawning and adulation manifested in the Amarna Letters to the Pharaoh. The Hebrew used throughout is simple and Biblical, though there are some peculiarities in words and syntax. The present writer, who has had the privilege of studying the letters in the original from photographs kindly supplied to him by Sir Charles Marston, and who hopes to comment on them elsewhere, has no hesitation in saying here that they form an excellent external corroboration of the historical statements made by the Biblical authors.

According to reports of the Samaria excavations, a few of the potsherds found there recently are

inscribed with the Divine name, 'To Yahweh' (לַיהוָה or לַיה). Nearly thirty years ago a specimen of this kind was discovered at Samaria by the Harvard Expedition, the inscription being scratched on the rim of a bowl and believed to date from the eighth century B.C.; and another sherd of the same character, forming the shoulder of a jar, came to light during excavations at Megiddo in 1932, and may be dated from 800-600 B.C. The Samaria ones, however, to which we refer, are believed to be of later date, certainly one or two centuries after the fall of the monarchy. The purpose of the inscriptions may have been to show, as Professor Sukenik suggests, that the contents of the vessels were dedicated to Yahweh, either as Temple taxes or voluntary tributes. So long as the monarchy existed in the northern kingdom, jar-handles and similar objects were doubtless inscribed 'For the king,' as we know was done in Judah, but since the government had now become a theocracy and Yahweh was the head of the nation, they were naturally inscribed with His name. They show that Yahweh worship continued in the northern kingdom long after the inhabitants of Samaria were deported by Sargon, and in spite of the influence of foreign cults.

Professor Garstang, in his fifth campaign at Jericho, has excavated to a depth of fourteen metres below the Middle Bronze stratum (2100-1400 B.C.). He has found that in the Early Bronze Age (roughly, the third millennium B.C.) the houses at first were circular, not unlike granaries though larger. Later, they were built square, and a strong defensive wall of brick was erected round the city. Lower down, in the next stratum (the Chalcolithic, *c.* 3700-3300 B.C.), he has discovered numerous grain wells, giving evidence of agricultural activity. The pottery here is an imitation of basket-work, and is adorned with broad bands accompanied by brown-painted triangles and other ornaments associated with the ceramic objects discovered by Père Mallon at Teleilat Ghassûl, and it is thus specially instructive as fixing the date of the civilization at this latter place. Lower still, in the Neolithic stratum (*c.* 4600-3700 B.C.), the houses are built solely of mud, with a coating of plaster on the face of the walls, but are remarkably well preserved. In this layer were found two groups of plastic statues together with evidences of a char-



acteristic flint industry. It is interesting to note that Professor Garstang, one of the most competent and trustworthy archaeologists, has thus probed into human occupation at Jericho during a period of two thousand years before Abraham. In the process he has unearthed no less than thirty thousand potsherds.

The Ras Shamra tablets continue to form an excellent commentary on the Old Testament. Some lines in the Baal epic (*Syria*, xvi. 29 ff.) remind us forcibly of corresponding Biblical passages. The verbal similarity, indeed, is so close that it cannot be due to chance. Thus (lines 8-9), 'Lo, thine enemies, O Baal, Lo, thine enemies wilt thou smite; behold, thine adversaries wilt thou cut off,' are almost identical with Ps 92<sup>9</sup>, 'For, lo, thine enemies, O Lord, for, lo, thine enemies shall perish; all the workers of iniquity shall be scattered'; while the next line, too, shows an equally remarkable resemblance to Ps 145<sup>13</sup> (Dn 3<sup>38</sup>). In the same tablet (lines 14, 16) we read of Baal striking the 'Suffete of the River' 'between the hands' (בין יָדַי). The latter expression is peculiar, but it gives us the correct interpretation of the words in *Zec* 13<sup>6</sup>, 'What are these wounds between thy hands?' for the parallelism in the context of the Ras Shamra verses shows that what is meant is 'between the shoulders' (הַתְּאֵר), i.e. 'on the back,' or more probably 'on the breast.' In the latest tablet published (*Syria*, xvi. 3) we read of God (El) 'laughing in (His) heart,' a form of words analogous to Gn 18<sup>12</sup>, 'Sarah laughed within herself,' the same Hebrew verb (חָסַח) being used in both cases. This tablet describes how Baal and Hûd (son of Dagon) engaged in a hunting expedition, but were both devoured by hybrid or fantastic beings. It is noteworthy that the name Hûd ('splendour'), which has probably some etymological connexion with Hadad, occurs in 1 Ch 7<sup>37</sup> as that of a man of Asher, and in other Biblical passages in theophorous names (Abi-hûd, Ahi-hûd, 'Ammi-hûd). It is interesting to find, too, that at Ras Shamra, in the fourteenth century B.C., the manifestations of mourning were similar to those in Israel, consisting mainly in rending the garments and covering the head with ashes. On the death of Aleyn, we read how Latpon left his usual place, and, sitting on the ground, rent his vesture and scattered chaff and ashes on his head. Three times also he uttered his lamentation in the same rhythmic type of metre as was used by the Israelite women when bewailing the dead, and to which Budde has given the name of the *Qinah* or 'dirge.' These mournful songs were uniformly

composed in verses of two members, the length of the first of which stands to that of the second in the proportion of 3 : 2, giving rise to a peculiar limping rhythm, in which the second member dies away as it were and expires. The measure, no doubt, is used in the Old Testament for a great variety of poems, and occurs frequently in the prophets, but whenever mourning women are introduced speaking in person (cf. Jer 9<sup>18, 20</sup> 38<sup>22</sup>), or assuming in a symbolic manner the rôle of mourners (*Am* 5<sup>1</sup>, *Ezk* 19, etc.), this kind of pentameter is uniformly chosen. We have thus identity of mourning customs and even of poetical 'dirge' among the Phœnicians and Israelites at this early age.

Important excavations, under Professor Speiser, have been made at *Tepe Gawra* ('The Great Mound'), which lies a few miles north-east of Nineveh (modern *Mosul*). The value of the site lies in the fact that, unlike all others in Northern Mesopotamia, it contains a virtually unbroken record which begins far back in the Neolithic period (that of the Obeid or earliest pottery), and extends to the middle of the second millennium B.C. There are over a dozen strata, two or three of them being separated by ashes, testifying to the repeated burning down of the place. In one layer (the IVth, c. 2000 B.C.) the charred bones of the inhabitants have been found strewn over the floor of the shrine and the pavements of the adjoining courtyards. The main fact apparent from the excavation is the existence of an advanced civilization in this cradle of humanity five thousand years ago, long before the Hurrians or the Hebrews came on the scene. Here, in these early times, was a lofty acropolis, with a large and progressive population, who had commercial and other associations with distant lands. A terra-cotta figurine of a covered wagon which has been unearthed, and which may be dated 2500 B.C., can only be compared with specimens found in Transcaucasia and Northern Syria, thus giving tangible proof of connexions with the transmontane regions. Many of the copper and other objects discovered are similar to the ones found at Susa, Mohenjo-daro, the Caucasus, and Central Europe, and the similarity is such that it cannot be mere coincidence. Commercial ties and correspondence seem to have linked the remotest corners of the world, as then known. Probably this advance in international intercourse was caused by the rise of copper as a decisive factor in civilization. At all events, this early period at *Tepe Gawra* affords undoubted witness to the wide inter-relations which form the background of the Copper Age;

and this is corroborated by Mr. Mallowan's Expedition (under the British Museum and the School of Archæology in Iraq), which has recently explored the Habur region of Northern Mesopotamia, examining more than sixty mounds, and which reports that, as early as 4000 B.C., there appears to have been a commercial route running all the way from Nineveh westward, by Jabal Sinjar and Northern Syria, to Anatolia. Clearly, there must have been a civilization so advanced that historians will be compelled to revise all previous views on the chronology of human evolution.

Among the objects discovered in Stratum VI (c. 3000 B.C.) are nineteen models of what Professor Speiser regards as horses. It has long been a highly controversial problem in Mesopotamian archæology as to whether the horse was known in these regions before the beginning of the second millennium, or at least the end of the third. The animal figures from Ur, at first thought to be horses, are now held by many scholars to represent the onager or Asiatic wild ass. But Professor Speiser is in no doubt as to the Gawra specimens, and his conclusion seems to be borne out by figurines from Kish and Billa (the Vth Stratum) and a vase painting from Khafaje in Lower Mesopotamia. It was many centuries later, so far as we know, that horses were introduced into Palestine. Probably they were brought by the Hyksos or Shepherd Kings, who no doubt journeyed down on horseback from their distant home. According to Sir Flinders Petrie, who found several of their mounts at *Tell el-Ajjûl* (Old Gaza), the species was a short-backed one, about fourteen and a half hands high. It was long afterwards, however, before the Israelites began to import horses. The first mention of them is in the Deuteronomic Code, where the king of Israel is forbidden to multiply them (Dt 17<sup>16</sup>), in case heathenish cults might thus be introduced or undesirable alliances made with Egypt.

The existence of advanced architectural knowledge at Gawra is apparent from the discovery of an excellent vaulted hall, dating from the end of the fourth millennium B.C., and built with true arch construction. The intrados spring up in a fine graceful curve. The origin of arches has hitherto been uncertain, but it must now be traced to Mesopotamia or farther eastward. If we except Arpachiya, another ancient centre four miles from Nineveh, the arch at Gawra is the earliest known one. At Ur, we know, the true vassoir arch has been found by Woolley in addition to the pure corbel vault, but

it is doubtful whether it is earlier than the third millennium. At Bethshan two rooms have been unearthed with arched roofs, and even one of the streets there appears to have been arched over, but the date of these structures cannot be earlier than about 1400 B.C. At Gezer cisterns of masonry, roofed with rough arches, have come to light, and in the Shephelah many caves are roofed in the same way, but all these constructions seem to belong to the Hellenistic period (500–100 B.C.). That the Gawra craftsmen, too, were by no means deficient in knowledge of metallurgy is evident from a remarkable copper ladle or pan which has been found (nearly all the metal objects are of copper). The noteworthy thing is that the whole of it, including a long handle, is raised from a single sheet of metal, all being in one piece. It is hammered and not cast, yet there is not a crack anywhere, although for five thousand years it has lain unprotected on a hard floor under a heavy mass of debris. The same skill is seen in the peculiar hairpins discovered. These are tapered down to a point at one end for insertion in the hair, while the other end is left broad and curled over into a tube, in which feathers or flowers were meant to be placed. Similar examples have been found at Ur, as well as in the Caucasus and the Danubian regions. But what endows the Gawra examples with additional interest is that the broad end is forked, so that the ornament becomes a double holder. Hitherto we have known nothing definite concerning slingstones, except that smooth stones from the brooks were used by the Hebrews (cf. 1 S 17<sup>40</sup>). At Gawra, however, and probably throughout Mesopotamia, pellets of clay, mostly ovoid, seem to have been in constant use. The excavators found them everywhere. There were no less than four hundred and sixty specimens in one narrow chamber. As many of them are poorly fired, perhaps it is these clay stones that are referred to in Job 41<sup>28</sup>, where 'leviathan' is said to turn them easily into 'stubble.'

Innumerable terra-cotta models of animals, chariots, wheels, couches, and various other objects, have been found at Gawra. At some of the sites in Palestine excavators have unearthed similar things, though of much later date, and the significance of such models has been the subject of much discussion. Perhaps they may have served simply as toys or ornaments, but it seems more likely that they had a religious connexion, being either commemorative or propitiatory or 'apotropaic' in character.



## Contributions and Comments.

### The Translation of John xvii. 5.

δόξασόν με σύ, Πάτερ, παρὰ σεαυτῷ τῇ δόξῃ ἣ ἔχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί.

Clarifica me tu Pater apud temetipsum claritate quam habui, prius quam mundus esset, apud te.

Two prepositional clauses, closely similar, are translated as if they were doing exactly the same work. But are they? Παρὰ σεαυτῷ is adverbial obviously to δόξασον. Παρὰ σοί is taken as being adverbial to ἔχον.

But it actually stands after the verb εἶναι; and it can be taken as a complement to it; 'before the world was in existence beside Thee.' This (1) avoids a redundancy; for the glory really consisted in that co-equal fellowship of the Persons within the one substance of the Godhead, implied in παρὰ σεαυτῷ. So that to relate παρὰ σοί to ἔχον adds nothing to the already expressed nature of the glory.

But (2)—(a) The adverbial clause πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί does add to the δόξα the very important quality of soleness. The glory was eternal, before the universe, and time, began.

(b) The cadence of the Greek is a matter in which highly cultivated taste might speak with authority; yet individual judgment must reserve its own freedom. To swing παρὰ σοί rather rapidly into conjunction with εἶναι seems to me a more natural intonation than to hold ἔχον waiting for a second adverbial clause to follow the first. But no commentator seems to have felt either the redundancy or that the sentence was hung up.

(c) That a preposition should be used twice in a short sentence with a different value is no more strange to any language, least of all to New Testament Greek, than to use it twice in an identical sense which adds nothing to the meaning.

(d) To take παρὰ σοί with εἶναι does not detract from the value of the text as testifying to the doctrine of the Incarnation and the pre-existence of the Divine Son, i.e. the doctrine of the Trinity. But it adds to the doctrine of Creation. It emphasizes the entire self-sufficiency of the Divine life, which had no need to create, no need of presence other than itself; life as to which the prepositions πρὸς (Jn 1<sup>1</sup>) and παρὰ could only be used in an eternal, spiritual sense, free from all conception of space, of outside, or of otherness.

The Son was παρὰ τῷ πατρί, and that relation was itself the glory which is the third Person of the Trinity. Beside them there was no other.

But God limited Himself and allowed a κόσμος to be 'alongside of Him' παρ' αὐτῷ. He allowed Himself to know it, instead of the knowing which was His eternal Son. It is not an expression of Him, as Hinduism and Pantheism make it, but real and distinct. It exists, because He made it, παρ' αὐτῷ alongside of Him.

Our Lord's words would emphasize the oneness of this creation, 'before' which there was no other, but God alone. And there is a sort of contrast between the 'with Thee' of the Eternal Son, who consented to be sent from the Father and to give up the glory (Ph 2<sup>10</sup>) and the 'with Thee' of Creation, whose first relation must be of separate-ness—'alienated from the life of God'—or a 'with' wholly other than that of the Son, but which can come to the Unity and glory, even as His own, since the love of God for creation is the same love as that with which 'before the foundation of the world' (v.<sup>24</sup>) the Father loved the Son.

The small but not unimportant correction I would make is to translate 'Glorify me with thine own self, with the glory which I had before the world existed beside Thee.' J. M. BALLARD.

St. Philip's Vicarage, Cheltenham.

### Mark vi. 48.

καὶ ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτούς.

Most English versions of this passage lend to θέλω its volitive meaning in more or less degree: 'he meant to pass them' (Moffatt), 'as if intending to pass them' (Weymouth. Cf. also *The Twentieth Century New Testament*, 'with the intention'), 'he would have passed by them' (A.V., R.V., Torrey). So Rawlinson: 'the Greek means that He wished.' But the context does not readily suggest such emphasis. The purpose ascribed to Jesus, 'to try, and by trial to strengthen faith' (Swete), hardly fits this setting. It is expressly stated that, out of concern for the disciples' distress on the sea, 'he cometh unto them.' Why then designedly pass by them? Mark's meaning may be, as Menzies suggests, that Jesus intended to show

Himself only momentarily and thus reassure His friends. Matthew (14<sup>25</sup>) omits the clause. Was he moved only by reverence for Jesus, or did he feel also the incongruity of the phrase, 'he was minded to pass by them?'

May we not see here an instance of the use of *θέλω* as a quasi-auxiliary approximating to an imminent future (cf. the analogous use of *μέλλω*), with little, if any, stress on volition; 'he was going to pass (or "on the point of passing") by them.' This weakened force of *θέλω* (*ἐθέλω*) *c.* Infinitive is established for classical Greek (Herodotus, Plato, Aristophanes). While used chiefly when the subject is a *thing*, it is found also with a *personal* subject. Cf. Aristophanes, *Wasps*, 536:

εἴπερ . . . οὗτός σ' ἐθέλει κρατῆσαι, 'if this fellow is to master you.' See also Plato, *Republic*, 375A, *Testaments of XII Patriarchs* (*Test. Reub.* i. 7). In Modern Greek *θέλω* in a periphrasis may serve for the ordinary Future tense. It is not unlikely that the Hellenistic stage in the development of this locution appears in Mk 6<sup>48</sup> and other possible N.T. instances, *e.g.* John, 1<sup>43</sup>. If examples were forthcoming from the LXX and the papyri this suggestion would be strengthened. At least it is questionable whether in all instances of *θέλω* in the N.T. the element of will is dominant.

H. G. MEECHAM.

*Hartley Victoria College,  
Manchester.*

## Entre Nous.

### Group Movements.

In his Introduction to *Group Movements throughout the Ages* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), the author, Dr. Robert H. Murray, Vicar of Pershore and Canon of Worcester, says: 'Religion is the pillar of fire which goes before the human race in its great march through history, showing it the way. We firmly believe that the Oxford Group Movement is now the pillar of fire, showing us this way once more.' In the light of Kierkegaard's words, 'We live forward, we understand backward,' he traces in this volume the place taken by the Group in the life of society.

Dr. Murray does not for a moment lose our interest as he writes in successive chapters of the Montanists of the second century, the Franciscans of the thirteenth, the Friends of God of the fourteenth, the Port Royalists of the seventeenth, the Methodists of the eighteenth, the Evangelicals of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth, and the Tractarians of the nineteenth century. And if sometimes it is difficult to trace the genealogy of the Oxford Group Movement through all these earlier revivals of religion, Dr. Murray hastens to disarm us by saying that he recognizes the differences in the movements, but underlying them all is the conception of 'the fellowship,' the community of fellowship created by the Holy Ghost. The

members of the fellowship share in the same spirit, and this spirit transforms them into a group with a life of its own. And then he goes farther and claims that the Oxford Group and these earlier movements have this in common that, when the blight of institutionalism has fallen on the Church, the Spirit of God labouring through them has restored to the Church its lost vitality.

What is the peculiar testimony of the 'Groups'? 'The Montanists are at hand to warn us of the conflict between order and progress, between the priest and the prophet, and to remind us of the fact that institutionalism is apt to lag behind the spiritual needs of a generation, and that this institutionalism requires to be vitalized by the Spirit of God. The Franciscans come to inform us that the utter sacrifice of self, the complete subduing of our will to God's, and the renunciation of the things of the body for the things of the Spirit are still part and parcel of our Christian life. The Friends of God seek to call us to a deeper realization of the fact that our aim in the spiritual life is to seek the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and that such a quest never fails to meet with its due reward. . . . The Port Royalists reinforce the same message, for did ever any community more steadfastly set before them the search for the Kingdom of God? . . . The Methodists and the



Evangelicals come to tell us that God loves all men. . . . High as is our opinion of the work of the Port Royalists, it almost seems as if they believed that salvation was only for the elect, and not for every man and every woman. John Wesley resembled Abraham Lincoln in his attitude to the common man.'

In a book so alive as this one and so accurate generally, it is perhaps ungracious to allude to mis-statements. We have, however, noted a certain number, especially in the section on Methodism.

The last seventy pages are devoted to a valuable account of the history and ideals of the Oxford Group Movement. Dr. Murray quotes the Archbishop of Canterbury, 'This Movement is most certainly doing what the Church of Christ exists everywhere to do. It is changing human lives.' So apt for his purpose are some verses of Drinkwater that he quotes them twice—'Grant us the will.' The leader never loses sight of the difficulty of maintaining the four absolutes—honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love, and his prayer and that of his associates is:

Grant us the will to fashion as we feel,  
Grant us the strength to labour as we know,  
Grant us the purpose, ribb'd and edged with steel,  
To strike the blow.

Knowledge we ask not—knowledge Thou hast  
lent,  
But, Lord, the will—there lies our bitter need,  
Give us to build above the deep intent  
The deed, the deed.

#### The Wondrous Cross.

'He [Frank N. D. Buchman] visited England in 1908, and drifted to Keswick at the time of the Convention. Weary of himself, weary of his religious work, he entered a tiny village church in Cumberland, where he found a woman addressing seventeen people. We gather that she was no Dinah Morris, but this unknown woman spoke out of the sincerity of her heart on the power of the Cross. The last sermon Matthew Arnold ever heard was preached by John Watson, divine and novelist, and its theme was the Cross of Christ. The hymn then sung was:

When I survey the wondrous Cross  
On which the Prince of Glory died.

Arnold on his return home repeated the lines, saying that the hymn was the finest in the English language. "Yes," he went on, "the Cross remaineth, and in the straits of the soul makes its ancient appeal." It certainly made its ancient appeal to Frank Buchman. He tells us of its effect: "A doctrine which I knew as a boy, which my church believed, which I had always been taught and which that day became a great reality for me."'<sup>1</sup>

#### Pacifism.

It will be remembered that Canon H. R. L. Sheppard published, in September 1935, *We Say "No."* We welcome very heartily a reprint. Written primarily to explain his Peace Pledge, 'I renounce War and never again, directly or indirectly, will I support or sanction another,' it is a powerful indictment of war from the standpoint of the man in the street as well as from the Christian standpoint. To turn to a point much in our minds at present. What line would Dr. Sheppard have us take about air-raid drill for civilians and their equipment with gas masks? 'We can, and I think we must, refuse to lend ourselves' to it, he replies categorically. He gives his reasons. There is doubt whether the appliances recommended will be of real service. 'As soon as gas-proof shelters can be constructed or gas masks produced in quantity for civilians, they will be out of date. Some one will have discovered a new compound that will penetrate them.' But more than that he stresses the psychological value that is believed to lie in air-raid drill from the militaristic point of view and so will have none of it. 'It creates the feeling that perhaps these raids won't be so bad, after all, because people can protect themselves and know what to do. It develops a habit of obedience which will be exceedingly convenient if war should come. And it is almost certain to induce resentment against the Power which is thought to be threatening us, and whose attitude makes the drill necessary.' 'If we take up this attitude, does that mean we shall refuse to use gas-proof shelters or gas masks if war comes and we are caught in an air raid? . . . The Pacifist in war time must be prepared to endure all things rather than abandon his principles, but he is not expected to sacrifice his own life uselessly.'

In the last chapter Dr. Sheppard pleads for a peace campaign. He gives a list of the great

<sup>1</sup> R. H. Murray, *Group Movements throughout the Ages*, 305.



personalities that he would fain see on the same platform vowing themselves to peace.

In this reference it is interesting to remember that Aldous Huxley has already appeared at the Friends' House and given a Pacifist address in which he said, 'If enough people address themselves to living up to the belief in a spiritual reality, to which all men have access and in which they are united . . . then there will be peace, for peace is the by-product of a certain way of life.' In the same address he pointed out the impossibility of realizing peace by means so hopelessly inappropriate as mass violence.

An outstanding pacifist is Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, and his powerful article in *The Christian World* lately on the 'Use and Misuse of Power' will not soon be forgotten. He ended with the thought that the love-ethic and the power-ethic are mortal enemies. 'To be a Christian means to take in your strong hands the love-ethic and go out into this pagan world to live by it, believe in it, adventure on it, sacrifice for it, until we make it victorious in the institutions of mankind.'

*We Say "No"* is published by Mr. John Murray at 3s. 6d. net, and all the profits go to financing his Peace Campaign.

#### 'Thou God seest me.'

Miss Cicely Hamilton writes in her autobiography, which has just come out and to which she gives the title *Life Errant*: 'Whatever else the acceptance of God may mean in our lives, this it must mean without a doubt: there is a Being—a Something, call It what you will—to whom it is impossible to lie. Of none among men can that magnificent "impossible" be said. Which among us, however desirous of honesty, does not practise petty subterfuge even to his friends? and—what matters more—does not practise it in flattery to himself? But to lift up your heart to God, even for a moment, is to place yourself, for that moment, in a Presence that annihilates deceit. *Thou God seest me* as in very truth I am, as no man on earth has ever seen me.'

#### Swept and Garnished.

'One of my friends at Cambridge was the late C. F. G. Masterman, and when I started work as a curate in Walworth he started work as a social worker in Camberwell. He used to tell how, when he was visiting from door to door in a great block of working-class flats, one poor woman greeted

him at her half-opened door with the remark, "Me and my 'usband don't take no interest in nothing." Alas, that is true of many people, and not of poor, uneducated people only. What wonder that, to a heart so swept and garnished, the devils of drink, gambling and lust find a ready entry. Joy in life, interest in other people and in the world are duties. So Stevenson writes, in *The Celestial Surgeon*, of his "great task of happiness"!'<sup>1</sup>

#### 'Go with him twain.'

'Life is our centurion; always laying burdens upon us, always compelling us to go weary miles in directions we do not desire. Well, we can make a grievance of life's claims on us, and so grow bitter and hard. Or we can do a little more than life asks of us and so turn the whole thing into a willing offering to God. I did not understand it at the time, but I think this must have been what a poor woman meant, five-and-twenty years ago and more, when she was speaking to me about keeping Lent. She was poor, and crippled with rheumatoid arthritis, and not, I fear, well treated by her husband. I said to her, "I should think you had pains enough without adding any because it's Lent." She replied, "But don't you see, Rector? Those are all laid on me and I can't refuse them. But a little extra of my own choosing takes the sting out of them all."'<sup>2</sup>

#### 'I am the light of the world.'

'There is a substance, known to men of science, called selenium. It is one of the chemical elements. And selenium has this peculiar property: normally it is a non-conductor of electricity. It lets no electricity through. But let light fall on it and immediately it becomes a conductor. Electricity can flow through it. And the amount of electricity that can flow through a selenium cell is exactly proportional to the amount of light that falls on it, so that the brightness of the faintest star can be measured by letting its light fall on a selenium cell and seeing how much current it lets pass. This is one of Nature's parables. Fallen human nature is like selenium. It is a non-conductor. It lets none of God's Wisdom, Love, and Might pass into this sad world. But let a ray of God's grace fall on a

<sup>1</sup> Peter Green, *This Our Pilgrimage*, 48.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 53.



human heart and straightway the man becomes a conductor and lets God into the world.<sup>1</sup>

### Mystery Tours.

The perfect children's sermon—how difficult it is to find! But try Stuart Robertson. Readers of this magazine know his qualities well, and now they can enjoy fifty-nine of his talks in *Mystery Tours*. The volume takes its name from the first address. The price of the volume is only 3s. 6d. net. The publishers are the R.T.S.

'Do you know what a "Mystery Tour" is? It was a bright idea that occurred to the manager of a bus company. Instead of advertising a tour to the Trossachs, or to Oxford, or some other place, he advertised "A Mystery Tour," because he knew people are attracted by mysteries. So when they said, "Where are you going to take us?" he said, "Ah, ha! that's a secret. Come and find it out" . . .

'Now "Mystery Tours" are not really a new invention. I find something like them in the Bible. Away in the far beginnings God said to Abraham, "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land"—can't you imagine Abraham listening eagerly to hear what land it was and where it was? But he isn't told. All he is told is that it is "to a land *that I will show thee*." A Mystery Tour! In the New Testament Jesus saw Peter and Andrew casting their nets, and He said, "Follow Me." Then He saw James and John mending their nets, and He said to them too, "Follow Me." He didn't say where He would take them, and I don't think they asked. There was something about Jesus which made them feel that wherever He took them they would be all right with Him, and it would be well worth while.

'Our life is like that. It is a "Mystery Tour." We don't know where we are going. We don't know how long the journey will be. We can't know. All we can know is Whom we are going with.

'There is a wide choice of buses and conductors. Here is one labelled "Pleasure." Its conductor says, "It will be fun and excitement all the way."

It sounds good; but I've seen people getting off that bus at the end of it all, and they were exhausted and played out. They had had so much excitement that at last nothing could excite them. They were bored with everything. No! I don't fancy that bus. . . .

'Another is labelled "Self." The conductor says, "We think of nobody but you, and you need think of nobody but yourself. If we see anybody in trouble, we'll speed up and get past on the other side. We'll pass everybody. . . . Come with us and look after yourself."

'Well, to tell the truth, I very soon get tired of myself. I need other people; some of them need me. I often want to get away from myself. No! it's hardly good enough. I don't fancy this bus either.

'Here is One who calls, "Follow Me." His voice isn't so loud and brassy as the others. He doesn't make such pretentious promises. He asks you simply and quietly to trust Him for the journey of life, and there is something about Him which moves one to feel it would be good to trust Him. We don't know where He will take us. Into much happiness? Yes! But into sorrow and into shadowed places too; yet into nothing that He can't bring you through, and nowhere that will leave bitter regrets and shamed remembrance. With Him you will miss nothing that is good, and the certain end of the Mystery Tour of Life with Jesus is the Father's House.

'You who read this are at the beginning of life's "Mystery Tour." With whom will you travel? There can be only one answer. You have often sung it. Now you are reading it. When you have read it, say it quietly, meaning it, as one who takes a solemn and glad vow—

"I will follow Jesus all the way."

---

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,  
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,  
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

<sup>1</sup> Peter Green, *This Our Pilgrimage*, 108.